DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 725 JC 800 434

AUTHOR	Elioff, Ione H.
TITLE	A Study of Part-Time Faculty and Recommendations for Faculty Development at Vista College...A Noncampus Community College.
PUB DATE	80
NOTE	129p.: Ed.D Dissertation, Nova University
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Annotated Bibliographies: College Faculty: *Community Colleges: Faculty College Relationship: *Faculty Development: Inservice Teacher Education: Literature Reviews: *Noncampus Colleges: *Part Time Faculty: Questionnaires: Resource Materials: School Surveys: Teacher Attitudes: Teacher Characteristics: Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	Vista College CA

ABSTRACT

A three-part study was conducted to help determine appropriate orientation and in-service activities for the part-time faculty of Vista College, a non-campus college in Berkeley, California. The first part of the study consisted of site visits to three other non-campus colleges. These visits revealed the colleges' commitment to professional development and that they were offering a variety of in-service activities, but that the colleges were experiencing a similar pattern of problems due to the teachers' physical isolation and to lack of funding. The study also included a survey of the in-service materials and resources available and appropriate for part-time faculty, which revealed that those materials designed specifically for part-time instructors focused primarily on policies and procedures and that no materials had been developed for part-time faculty in non-campus colleges. Materials considered useful for Vista faculty were organized in an annotated bibliography. Finally, the study sought to determine the needs and characteristics of Vista's faculty. A survey, which was completed by 299 of the 408 instructors at the college, provided information on their perceptions of the college and their faculty development preferences. The study report includes a review of the literature, the bibliography of staff development materials, and the questionnaire. (Author/AYC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED188725

A Study of Part-Time Faculty and Recommendations For Faculty Development at Vista College... A Noncampus Community College

Ione H. Elioff

A MAJOR APPLIED RESEARCH PROJECT
PRESENTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

1980

JC 800 434

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ione H. Ellioff

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sincere appreciation and thanks are expressed to many who cooperated in the development and completion of this study.

To the part-time faculty of Vista College who participated in the study.

To Queen Randall of Pioneer Community College, to Ron Berggeron of Coastline Community College, and Joyce Elsner and Maxine Hardaway of Rio Salado Community College who were willing to share information about the challenges and problems of providing professional development activities for part-time faculty in noncampus colleges.

To John Holleman, President of Vista College and Richard Ricca, Dean of Instruction for their professional guidance and support for the study.

To Lynn Whitmore for her assistance in editing and for helpful suggestions during the study process.

To Dale Tillery, major advisor, for his advice and guidance.

To Ernest Berg, local professional reader, for his suggestions and thoughtful comments.

To George M. Barton, central staff committee member, for his support for the study.

To the Northern California Research Consortium (NORCAL) for their support for the study through a maximum research grant of $500.

Abstract of a Major Applied Research Project Proposal Presented
to Nova University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

A STUDY OF PART-TIME FACULTY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AT VISTA COLLEGE... A NONCAMPUS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

By

Ione H. Elioff

June, 1980

Vista College is a noncampus college staffed by part-time faculty who teach in over 200 locations scattered throughout the Peralta Community College District, which includes six communities in the San Francisco Bay Area. In a three-year period from 1976-1979 the number of faculty increased from 50 to 400. Providing adequate orientation, inservice activities and communication with the faculty was a major problem for college administrators.

This research project was designed to provide descriptive data about (1) how other noncampus colleges were providing faculty development for their part-time faculty, (2) inservice materials and resources available and appropriate for part-time faculty and (3) characteristics of Vista College faculty and their needs and preferences related to faculty development.

Site visits were made to Coastline Community College, Pioneer Community College and Rio Salado Community College. It was found that faculty development was considered important, but

especially problematic, by administrators in these colleges. All three colleges were offering a variety of inservice activities, and all were experiencing a similar pattern of problems due to: (1) the physical isolation of faculty who taught in many different community locations, (2) faculty whose major work role was nonacademic, and (3) lack of funding and administrative personnel for faculty development activities.

A survey of print and audio-visual resources revealed that there was a wealth of faculty development material available, most of which had been designed for use by full-time faculty. Some materials were located which had been designed specifically for part-time faculty, most of which emphasized college policies and procedures rather than teaching and learning issues. No materials were located which had been developed specifically for part-time faculty in noncampus colleges. Materials reviewed included periodicals, books, resource center activities, and self-instructional written and videotaped units. Materials considered useful for faculty development at Vista College were selected and organized into an annotated bibliography.

A survey questionnaire was completed by 299 of the 408 faculty (73 percent) who had taught at the college during the three-year study period. The survey provided information about the characteristics of the faculty, their perceptions about teaching at the college, and their preferences for faculty development activities. Results indicated that as a group the faculty liked teaching at Vista, were in agreement with the mission and goals of the college, and derived personal growth from teaching adult students. Problems associated with the noncampus structure--isolation of faculty, provisions of support services to community locations, registration procedures and paperwork--were identified as needing attention and improvement. Faculty showed a willingness to participate in the development of the college, and over two-thirds were willing to participate voluntarily in three hours or more of inservice activities each semester. Their priorities for faculty development topics were: (1) student retention, (2) how adults learn, (3) how to become an effective teacher, (4) teacher evaluation, and (5) development of the instructional program. The best methods of inter-faculty communication were thought to be: (1) a regular newsletter dealing with teaching and learning, (2) a series of short seminars which faculty could attend based on their individual interests, and (3) annual discipline/program group meetings.

The study led to the following conclusions: first, that there is a recognized need to provide effective inservice professional development activities for part-time faculty; second, that noncampus colleges staffed primarily by part-time faculty have unique characteristics and problems related to provision of faculty development; and third, there is a need to develop new inservice materials and techniques appropriate for part-time faculty.

A three-year experimental, internal faculty development model for Vista College was recommended. The following broad recommendations were suggested as a philosophical and practical base for future inservice activities at the college: (1) establish faculty development as a component of the organizational structure of the college; (2) plan and evaluate faculty development activities with the assistance of an internal advisory group; (3) link faculty development to the goals of the college, (4) associate faculty development with evaluation of instruction; (5) provide trained college personnel for technical assistance to part-time faculty, and (6) develop a communication system which encourages a dialogue among and between faculty and administrators about teaching and learning issues.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES ix

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Background and Significance 1

Research Questions 5

Definition of Terms 6

Assumptions and Limitations 7

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 8

The Need for Community College Faculty Development 8

Factors Influencing Current Faculty Development Activities 12

Part-Time Faculty Development Issues 14

The Noncampus College Part-Time Faculty Development 17

III. PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY 20

A Study of Faculty Development Activities at Three Noncampus Colleges 20

A Study of Materials and Resources Related to Part-Time Faculty Development 22

A Survey of Vista College Faculty 23

Chapter Page

IV. FINDINGS 27

Faculty Development Activities at Three Noncampus Colleges 27

Review of Materials and Resources Related to Part-Time Faculty Development 39

Results of Vista College Faculty Survey 43

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 75

Summary of Faculty Development Activities at Three Noncampus Colleges 75

Summary of Materials Related to Part-Time Faculty Development 76

Summary of Vista College Faculty Survey 78

Conclusions 83

Recommendations for Improvement of Practice 85

Strategies for Diffusion, Implementation and Change 87

BIBLIOGRAPHY 93

APPENDIXES 97

A. Materials and Resources of Value for Planning Faculty Development Activities at Vista College . . . 98

B. Questionnaire: Vista College Faculty Survey 106

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Frequency Distribution of Educational Background of Faculty (N 299) 45
2. Frequency Distribution of Age of Faculty (N 299) 45
3. Frequency Distribution of Faculty Teaching Experience at Vista College (N 299) 47
4. Range of Prior Teaching Experience of Part-Time Faculty (N 231) 49
5. Range of Reasons Given for Teaching by Part-Time Faculty (N 266) 51
6. Frequency Distribution of Income Derived From Part-Time Teaching (N 266) 52
7. Extent of Faculty Agreement With College Objectives (N 299) 54
8. Frequency Distribution of Faculty Feeling Toward Teaching (N 299) 65
9. Percentage Distribution of Priority Topics for Faculty Inservice Activities (N 299) 69
10. Frequency Distribution of Response to How Vista College Can Best Communicate With Part-Time Faculty (N 299) 71

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background and Significance

Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study was created by the Board of Trustees of the Peralta Community College District in the Spring of 1974. It was the fifth college in a district that serves the cities of Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, Emeryville, Oakland and Piedmont in the San Francisco Bay Area, and the residents of rural Plumas County in Northern California.

The new college was given two missions: to develop and use a variety of innovative instructional methods and to reach out to students whose educational needs were not being served by existing institutions in the District or local area. Competence-based instructional programs were envisioned as the major non-traditional approach to be developed and all college classes would be offered in community locations. It was also planned that part-time faculty would be responsible for the majority of the college's teaching assignments, assisted by a small group of full-time administrators and instructional planners.

During the 1975-76 academic year, a president was selected, and additional staff--all housed in a Berkeley office building--began to plan and implement various college projects. Initial work focused on the development of a competency-based degree program that was targeted for a rather small, well-motivated group of learners. During the college's first and second years of operation (1975-77), a small number of conventional classes were offered in over 20 different community locations, and enrollments stabilized at approximately 900 part-time students each semester. Classes were taught by approximately 50 part-time faculty each year.

In 1977, however, internal and external pressures caused major administrative and programmatic changes within the college. Internally, faculty and staff from the other colleges in the District viewed this new college as an unreasonable drain on their resources in a time of grim projections of future enrollment decline and economic constraints. External pressures also appeared when the State of California rejected most of the college's proposed new courses/programs, and when the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) did not approve the college's initial accreditation application. After the president of the college resigned in May of 1977, a District vice-chancellor--as acting president--reorganized the college staff and successfully re-submitted the accreditation application to WASC.

This change in leadership was accompanied by new staff and new priorities for the college. While staff continued to develop competency-based non-traditional learning programs, high priority was attached to the recruitment of large numbers of new, non-traditional types of students: the college needed an enrollment increase to become more cost-effective, and the District needed additional students.

During the 1977-78 academic year, a new president was selected, and the college staff initiated extensive efforts to contact potential student constituencies through local business and social service organizations and community groups. The small group of administrators and faculty assigned to planning roles were quite successful in matching instructional offerings to the educational needs of local residents and workers; 1977-79 enrollments increased dramatically to 6,000 part-time students.

Increased community activities led to a name change for the college in 1978. Prospective students and members of the community were uncertain and confused about the meaning of "non-traditional," and the Peralta Board of Trustees adopted a new name--Vista College--that implied the new views and passages that the college wished to encourage. And, during the 1978-79 academic year, over 8,000 part-time students participated in Vista classes.

The college has always been staffed by part-time faculty, and it was possible to provide orientation and adequate support for the small number of faculty (50 each year) who taught during the college's first two years of operation. However, as the college expanded rapidly from 1977-79, the part-time teaching staff grew at a parallel rate: 250 faculty were hired in 1977-78, and 350 were or had been associated with the college by the end of the 1978-79 academic year.

This large group of faculty functioned as a pool of instructors who were called upon to teach as program needs arose. Some were part-time instructors who were employed at other colleges in the District. A few were full-time contract staff from the other Peralta Colleges who were willing to teach an extra service class through Vista. The majority were new instructors, many with no prior teaching experience, who were chosen to teach because of their special expertise in business or professional areas.

Vista administrative staff attached high priority to providing adequate orientation and support to these faculty, but, given the small number of administrative staff and the college's flexible instructional system, faculty development activities were hurried and superficial during these two years of rapid expansion. The college staff were committed to offering short-term classes that began at various times throughout the year, which demanded a continuous faculty selection process. Consequently, faculty were often chosen for teaching assignments on very short notice. Individual faculty, physically isolated by the scattered geographic placement of their classes, were disassociated from the activities of the college as a whole, and they did not feel a strong sense of community with other faculty or the administrative staff. Instructional planners on the college staff were able to provide only minimal orientation, instructional support and inservice activities for faculty.

During discussions between faculty and administrative staff at several informal inservice seminars and at a well-attended workshop (April, 1979), faculty indicated that they needed and wanted more information about teaching strategies, and that they were interested in participating more directly in the development of college programs and classes. These faculty comments strongly reinforced the college's goals of providing adequate orientation to large numbers of part-time faculty, finding effective ways of communicating with them, and providing a useful, cohesive set of inservice activities for all faculty.

The problem of developing effective orientation, communication and inservice strategies for part-time faculty has particular significance for Vista and other noncampus colleges. In the noncampus setting, each faculty member is often the single and/or most visible representative of the college in the community. Faculty must perform multiple teaching and counseling roles, without the full complement of instructional and counseling services provided by traditional, campus-based colleges. It is absolutely critical then, to the life of the college and work of the students, that faculty be able to function comfortably and competently in their diverse roles, while physically isolated from the academic community to which they belong.

Research Questions

This Major Applied Research Project (MARP) was designed to produce descriptive data that would enable Vista administrators to develop an effective, cohesive faculty development program. Four questions were central to this research project and to the college's future efforts in this area: How did other noncampus colleges offer orientation and inservice activities to their part-time faculty? What materials and resources--local and national--would be appropriate for part-time faculty? What were the inservice needs and preferences of the Vista part-time faculty? What kinds of faculty development activities would be most effective in Vista's noncampus setting?

It was anticipated that answers to the project's first three questions would quite naturally lead to the development of an effective part-time faculty development program in a noncampus college. Descriptive data about existing programs, materials and resources would enable Vista administrators to analyze a variety of strategies that had been used elsewhere. Such data, combined with a descriptive profile of Vista part-time faculty--their teaching backgrounds and their inservice priorities--would enable Vista administrators to offer a faculty development program that would be well suited to its audience and setting.

In order to answer these research questions, the research project was designed to include four separate components: (1) a study of faculty development at three noncampus community colleges; (2) a review of materials and resources related to part-time faculty development; (3) a survey of the faculty who had taught at Vista College during a three-year period; and (4) a review of the three components above by the research project advisory committee.

Definition of Terms

Several key terms are used in the description and analysis of this research project. They are defined as follows:

1. Noncampus Community College. A community college which maintains central facilities for administrative and support services and offers instruction in rented or donated community facilities throughout a given geographic area.
2. Part-Time Faculty. A term to describe a non-tenured certificated instructor who may be employed for a maximum of 60 percent of a full-time teaching load.
3. Staff Development. Programs or activities designed to improve the professional competency of all staff members (administrators, faculty, clerical staff) in a community college.
4. Faculty Development. Programs or activitiesdesigned to improve the professional competencies of teachers in community colleges.
5. Inservice Activities. Programs or activities designed to improve the professional competencies of teachers. Used synonymously with the term faculty development.

Assumptions and Limitations

The following assumptions formed a basis for the importance and selection of research activities:

1. Staff development is a necessary function of a community college.
2. Staff development activities will contribute to the achievement of the mission and goals of a community college.
3. It is necessary to identify faculty development needs as perceived by the faculty themselves.
4. Information resulting from this study will be helpful in the planning of faculty development activities.

The activities and conclusions of this study are subject to the following limitations:

1. The study will be limited to the population of faculty who have taught at Vista College within a three-year period.
2. The study will not attempt to describe the factors which influence the respondents and have influence on their perceptions.
3. The study will not attempt to show a relationship between faculty development and improved instructional effectiveness.
4. The study will be limited to recommendations for a plan for faculty development and will not be concerned with implementation and evaluation.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The literature review described here focused on the emergence of the need for faculty development in community colleges, factors influencing current faculty development activities, issues related to the professional development of part-time faculty, and challenges related to providing development services to part-time faculty in the noncampus community college setting.

The Need for Community College Faculty Development

Faculty development emerged as a significant issue after the rapid growth of the community college movement between 1960 and 1970. In that ten-year expansionary period, the number of two-year colleges increased by 61 percent, which led to a 271 percent increase in students and a 327 percent increase in staff (O'Banion, 1976:26). In the Fall of 1970, nearly 2,400,000 students were attending 1,070 community and junior colleges throughout the United States (Junior College Journal, February, 1971).

Following this major growth period, the research of Medsker and Tillery (1971:100) produced a profile of two-year colleges. Analysis of their data led to an expression of concern about the need to improve the quality of community college teaching through well-conceived inservice training. Their study indicated that administrators usually planned to provide inservice education, but that the pressure of time and other problems seemed to minimize the incidence of inservice activities. Two recommendations were made: that teacher training institutions assume responsibility for designing cooperative inservice projects with community colleges and that a national drive be undertaken to prepare and develop junior college faculty and administrators.

Soon thereafter, attention did shift to the quality of instruction in community colleges. It was as if a "breathing period" had come, and consideration was given to the quality as well as the quantity of instruction. The improvement of community college teaching began to emerge as a national theme. An example of this national focus was a 1972 report submitted to the President and Congress by the National advisory Council on Education Professions Development which stated that the pool of teachers available for work at community and junior colleges was "woefully inadequate" because current instructors "did not know how to teach," and teacher education programs were doing little to help them learn. The Council recommended that the highest priority be given to new and effective inservice training programs because teachers were not in tune with the colleges' objectives of providing an education for the often undereducated students they enrolled (Education Daily, May 31, 1972).

National educational associations also turned their attention to improving the quality of instruction in two-year colleges. For example, in 1973 the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) selected staff development as the theme for its national assembly meeting (O'Banion, 1976:26). The broad term "staff development" indicated inservice activities for all segments of a college staff: administrators, faculty, and clerical/classified employees.

Support for faculty development and ways to provide effective programs soon became a major topic in the literature related to community colleges (O'Banion:1972,1976,1977,1978; Centra:1972; Davis:1976; Hammons and Wallace:1978). A retrospective overview of the inadequacies of faculty who were hired during the intensive growth period of community colleges and the need to improve the quality of teaching was contributed by Scigliano (1978:154) who wrote:

> Two decades ago most individuals now in this profession were thrown together much as were National Football League expansion teams; they were recruited from high schools, universities, four-year colleges, businesses and myriad others known at that time. These persons joined to serve a new clientele in a middle level space in the higher education spectrum. Rapid expansion during 1960-1970 provided little time for concern about competencies in the newly formed profession; the search for more and more personnel to cope with the rising tide of students became the biggest problem. As the sixties passed and enrollments began to level off, concern shifted from within the college to the nature and quality of professional staff. Competency is a perishable commodity, even though teachers may have been competent initially, their skills were soon questioned.

Many two-year colleges did initiate faculty development programs in the early 1970's. At this time, a high level of faculty inservice activities was reported in four-year institutions as well. Gaff (1975) gathered descriptions of hundreds of faculty development programs, primarily in four-year colleges and universities, to analyze the operation of these programs and identify their limitations and advantages. The extensiveness of this study and other literature describing activities in community colleges showed that "faculty development" was an established practice in post-secondary education by the end of the 1970's. Many colleges offered their faculties a variety of professional development options.

The patterns for offering faculty development opportunities ranged from support for individual study to occasional workshops or seminars to comprehensive programs. How 11 districts and 17 colleges were providing various types of faculty development activities was described in a Staff Development and Resource Inventory Directory published by the League for Innovation in the Community Colleges (1977). This project was designed to link those interested in sharing philosophy, processes and procedures for staff development. The directory included a variety of faculty inservice activities which ranged from grants for individual projects to organized workshops and courses for faculty. Examples of comprehensive, well-organized and supported faculty development programs were found in Florida and Illinois (Novak and Barnes, 1977: 11-18) and in California at Los Medanos College (Case, 1976:63-77) and Cañada College (Wenrich and Eakin, 1976:8-13).

During this time, the Peralta Community College District, with which Vista College is affiliated, primarily supported an individualized approach to faculty development. The District provided funds for Faculty Initiated Projects (FIPP) grants as described by Paul Elsner in the previously cited League for Innovation Publication (1977:3):

> The mission of the Faculty Initiated Projects is to stimulate and reward faculty initiative and creativity through assisting in the development of projects that have educational value to the entire district. The program provides set-aside moneys primarily in the form of stipends (assigned-time, supplies, technical assistance, consultation) to subsidize efforts of the faculty to develop innovative programs. A district evaluation committee of faculty members reviews and evaluates proposals. The Chancellor makes the final selection based on their recommendation. At the present time over 50 faculty members are engaged in the development of new methods and materials.

While this project resulted in significant personal growth for individual faculty members, there was no attempt to provide a comprehensive district-wide approach to faculty development. This narrow rather than broad focus was observed in a study which compared full-time faculty and administrator perceptions of staff development needs within the Peralta District (Cato, 1978:5):

> ...Collectively, the colleges (Alameda, Feather River, Laney, Merritt and Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study) enroll more than thirty-four thousand students in a wide age range and with a variety of interests. However, those colleges within the District have not made an organized attempt at inservice staff development since the District was formed in 1964. The idea of staff development seems to be accepted in theory, but little has been done by way of program practice. Some past fragmentary practices include: sabbatical leaves; travel and conference leaves; salary increments for course work; grants for innovative projects; inservice workshops or seminars and guest speakers. These efforts constitute the extent of staff development in the Peralta Community College District.

In general, many community colleges attended to faculty development during the early and mid-nineteen seventies, a time when the improvement of teaching was a high priority and support for faculty development was provided in varying degrees. The late seventies, however, brought new economic and demographic factors which influenced the content and practices of faculty development activities.

Factors Influencing Current Faculty Development Activities

Although the literature of the early and mid-seventies supported the need for faculty development and reported various programs, a 1979 study by Al Smith (1980) found that a large number of community colleges lacked an organized program for staff development. Smith's study partly replicated a 1976 study of faculty development practices in community colleges by John Centra (1976). Smith (1980:59) found that in the three-year period since Centra's study, there appears to have been little increase in the number of full-time faculty involved in staff development. While there was a slight increase in the numbers of part-time faculty participating in staff development, emphasis remained on full-time faculty and the most successful programs were those that had been designed for full-time faculty. The study concluded that some of the greatest challenges for staff development specialists appear to be in the development of effective programs for groups other than full-time faculty. The study also concluded that financial support for staff development in community colleges has declined since 1976.

In the late 1970's two important factors influenced faculty development activities: stable or declining enrollments and diminished economic support for postsecondary education. As enrollments in many community colleges stabilized or declined, fewer new, full-time permanent faculty were hired, since colleges often chose not to replace permanent contract faculty as they retired or resigned. Colleges struggled with the management of decline, a circumstance described succinctly by economist Kenneth Boulding (1975:4-8). In this period of retrenchment (Astin, 1974) faculty development activities began to focus on renewal, with emphasis placed on helping faculty improve their teaching and, in some cases, change their teaching roles. In some cases, faculty were retrained to teach in a new subject area in order to maintain their jobs as student enrollments declined.

In addition to declining enrollments, California postsecondary institutions have had to absorb the economic impact of a 1978 tax initiative. Proposition Thirteen, by reducing the tax base available for public services and education, drastically changed both the organization and supply of financial support for community colleges. The initiative sharply curtailed the hiring of new full-time faculty, and some colleges were forced to reduce their nontenured, full-time teaching staff.

This change in funding mechanism and support level stimulated a critical review of instructional service activities in most community colleges. Faculty development activities were often judged to be extra-cost activities and therefore often eliminated. In colleges where faculty development activities were continued, programs strongly emphasized the renewal of full-time faculty as a positive response to the need for institutional change.

Economic constraints and declining enrollments have also affected the status of part-time faculty. Many community colleges have chosen to use fewer part-time instructors, while other colleges have hired more part-timers in an effort to reduce instructional costs, since salaries for hourly part-time faculty are less than salaries for contract, full-time faculty. The use of part-time faculty in community colleges is not a new practice, but professional development for part-time faculty has been limited or non-existent.

Part-Time Faculty Development Issues

The number of part-time faculty teaching in community colleges has proliferated in recent years. Gleazer (1977) reported that part-time instructors represented 56 percent of the total faculty teaching in American community colleges in 1976. While full-time faculty are responsible for a major part of community college instruction, a trend toward hiring of part-time faculty is evident in California. An early survey (Heinberg, 1966) showed that 90 percent of the colleges surveyed employed more part-time than full-time instructors. Forty districts had more than twice the number of part-timers as full-timers. The overall ratio of part-time to full-time instructors was 67.2 percent to 32.8 percent. It was expected that this ratio disparity would increase (Ross, 1975).

There are many controversial issues related to the increase in the number of part-time faculty: use of part-time faculty as an inexpensive source of labor (Lombardi, 1975; Scully, 1975); wages and benefits (Fryer, 1977); effectiveness of part-time versus full-time faculty (Leslie, 1978; Ernst and McFarlane, 1978) and collective bargaining related to rights and status (Head, 1978).

The need to include part-time faculty in staff development activities has been recognized by a number of researchers. Louis Bender (1972:21-27) called attention to the need for staff development of adjunct or part-time faculty, calling them "forgotten or neglected." Later, he called them "step children of the community college" (1973: 29-37). Hoenninger and Black reiterated this theme (1978:25-27), describing part-timers as a "neglected species" and expressing concern about entrusting quality in community colleges to part-time faculty. Williams noted in a study of part-time faculty that ... "aside from the name of the text, the location of the classroom, occasionally a course syllabus, part-time instructors get little orientation or inservice training" (1972:83-84).

In a recent report which included a national perspective on part-time faculty, David Leslie wrote:

> Part-time faculty are responsible for a substantial portion of the total ins-ructional output in the nation's colleges and universities; yet they remain essentially uncounted, unobserved and uninvolved in the academic enterprise (1978:3).

Leslie's report concludes that:

> A creative and supportive environment is needed if part-time faculty are to find their working conditions attractive... Many institutions will find part-timers to be an indispensable part of their work force in a constraining and uncertain future. Attention to their interests, moral and professional development will be essential to a productive relationship (1978:5).

Since part-time faculty are responsible for a significant amount of instruction in community colleges, researchers agree that attention should be paid to their professional development. This conclusion is strongly supported by Mertes (1975:7) who reviewed studies of part-time faculty and stated:

> Nearly all studies show that as a group part-time instructors have lower qualifications as measured by formal education and less teaching experience than full-time instructors. Studies also show that part-time instructors receive very little orientation, pre-service, or inservice help preparatory to taking up their teaching duties. Despite these observable differences, there is very little evidence that part-time instructors are inferior teachers to full-time or vice versa. There is also little evidence to support the claim that colleges "are hiring from private business and industry and other public sectors the most highly qualified individuals as determined by their professional colleagues in that given employment sector."

While there has been strong agreement on the need for faculty development activities for part-timers, relatively little seems to have been provided. College administrators may have good intentions in regard to offering activities, but there are problems associated with part-time faculty development. These problems include, in many colleges, an unwillingness to embrace a philosophical committment to include part-timers as an integral part of the staff. There has been unwillingness to spend funds on the professional development of faculty who are not tenured and who may be with the institution for a short time period. On the other hand, when part-timers are invited to participate in development activities designed primarily for full-time faculty, there is often a low level of participation for several reasons: in most cases, part-timers are not paid to attend activities; activities are often held at inconvenient times for part-timers; and sometimes the content of activities is not relevant.

The Noncampus College and Part-Time Faculty Development

In the past few years, several unconventional community colleges have been created which employ part-time faculty for all or almost all teaching assignments. This research project is concerned with such an institution, which was included in Lombardi's recent study (1977:1) of noncampus colleges.

> The oldest of the noncampus colleges, Whatcom Community College in the state of Washington, was founded in 1970; followed by the Community College of Vermont in 1971; Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study in 1974; Chicago City-Wide College (formerly institute) and Chicago Urban Skills Institute in 1975; and Pioneer Community College, Coastline Community College, and the Los Angeles Office for New Dimensions in 1976. These are the official dates; all the colleges had varying gestation periods before they became legal entities by action of their respective state and/or local governing bodies. Each of the colleges is accredited or has applied for accreditation.

These seven noncampus colleges varied in size, organizational structure and mission, but all operated with central administration and support facilities, with all classes taught in rented or loaned facilities throughout the geographical area served by the college. Two of the colleges each formed single-institution districts; the other colleges were all members of multi-campus districts that included from three to ten colleges.

The list of noncampus colleges has changed only slightly since Lombardi's study: New Dimensions was discontinued in 1978; and a new institution, Rio Salado Community College, was established in Phoenix, Arizona.

Lombardi's study (1977:2) discusses three reasons the noncampus community colleges have come into existence. First, as a reaction to interest in external degree programs of an experimental nature. He observed:

> Among major influences in the development of the noncampus colleges are the interest aroused by the English Open University and the University of London, The American University Without Walls, Regents External Degree, Empire State College and the Minnesota Metropolitan State College, all of which offer external degrees; and the Report of the Commission on Non-Traditional Study.

Second, Lombardi surmised that even if there had been no colleges without walls as models, the noncampus college might still have emerged from the efforts to coordinate the activities of the many community college outreach programs and to provide for the faculty and students in these programs the support services necessary for effective teaching and learning. (1977:2).

A third reason for creation of these colleges had to do with economy. One of the advantages cited for the noncampus college over the campus college is the cost benefit to be derived from the use of existing sites and from the employment of part-time rather than full-time faculty. Also these noncampus colleges, because of their lack of permanence can quickly respond to changing educational needs allowing more flexibility in instructional offerings in the midst of rapid social and economic change. Hiring of part-time nontenured faculty to offer flexible course offerings has been a distinguishing characteristic of the noncampus colleges. Inservice training for faculty teaching in these colleges has been minimal and is a problem for administrators.

Lombardi's study indicated that the overwhelming majority of instructors in the noncampus colleges teach on a part-time basis. It was his observation that effective inservice training was not apparent in these colleges and commented about some of the problems in providing inservice in the following manner:

> Noncampus administrators have not found the solution to effective inservice training... Efforts to institute formal inservice have not been very successful because of cost involved, lack of response and logistics of time and place for those teaching one night a week in widely scattered places. (1977: 53).

Provision of faculty development activities in a noncampus college is difficult, but important. The purpose of this MARP was to investigate ways to improve part-time faculty development in a noncampus college.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY

The research project was composed of our components: (1) a study of faculty development activities at three noncampus community colleges; (2) a review of materials and resources related to part-time faculty development; (3) a survey of the faculty who had taught at Vista College during a three-year period; and (4) a review of the three components above by the research project advisory committee. The following sections describe the procedures and methods that were used in each component of the research project.

A STUDY OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES AT THREE NONCAMPUS COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Visits were made to three noncampus colleges: Pioneer Community College in Kansas City, Missouri; Rio Salado Community College in Phoenix, Arizona; and Coastline Community College in Fountain Valley, California. Selection of these colleges was made on the basis of their similarity to Vista College. Each was a member of a multicampus district, and each was staffed primarily by part-time faculty who taught in a variety of community locations.

At each college, administrative staff responsible for the instructional program and related faculty development activities were interviewed. On-site discussions with administrators did not follow a formal interview instrument, but each administrator was asked similar kinds of questions about the college and its faculty development activities. Interview questions elicited information about the organization of the college, the characteristics of its part-time faculty, the existing faculty orientation, communication and inservice activities, and the problems associated with faculty development activities in the noncampus setting.

Pioneer Community College

A full day series of interviews was held in February of 1979 with Queen Randall, President, and Ashley Johnson, Dean of Instruction. In addition, instructional and inservice materials were collected, and several faculty offered their comments on teaching in a noncampus college.

Rio Salado Community College

In a full day visit in June of 1978, Lionel Martinez, Dean of Instruction was interviewed. The college was then in its preliminary operational stage, so discussions with the instructional dean and four administrative program planners focused on future faculty inservice priorities and activities. Follow-up telephone interviews with another instructional dean, Joyce Elsner, and the administrator in charge of inservice, Francine Hardaway, were conducted during Spring and Fall semesters (1979). Discussion during four telephone contacts centered on how the proposed faculty development activities were proceeding as the college became operational.

Coastline Community College

In a five-day period in April of 1979, a series of interviews was conducted with Edward Decker, Dean of Instruction, and Ronald Berggren, Associate Dean of Occupational Education. In addition, an area center of the college was visited, where staffing patterns and inservice activities/materials were observed.

A STUDY OF MATERIALS AND RESOURCES RELATED TO PART-TIME FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

In order to find materials and resources which would be useful for planning future faculty development activities at Vista College, a search of the literature was made through conventional library research methods, and a computerized search of ERIC documents and Dissertation Abstracts was conducted. In addition, people known to be interested in staff development in community colleges were asked about any materials they knew of which had not been described in the literature.

The study process included collection of materials which had been designed for full-time and part-time faculty in both four-year and two-year institutions. Books and periodicals were reviewed, as well as manuals, multi-media materials and individualized learning modules. Information was also gathered on local and national "people" resources--organizations and consultants who were able and willing to provide faculty development assistance.

After careful examination, materials and resources judged to be most appropriate for inservice activities for part-time faculty in a noncampus community college were selected. These key materials and resources were summarized and annotated in Appendix A.

A SURVEY OF VISTA COLLEGE FACULTY

Four steps were included in the survey of Vista faculty: questionnaire development, determination of population to be surveyed, collection of data, and analysis of data. Each step is described in the following sections.

Questionnaire Development

The questionnaire was developed in the following manner:

1. An advisory committee of six members was formed to help develop the questionnaire. The committee consisted of the Dean of Instruction and five program planners, full-time faculty who had been assigned to develop and coordinate instruction at the college. The committee selected the following domains for inclusion in the survey: (a) description of the characteristics of the faculty; (b) faculty opinions and perceptions about teaching at Vista; (c) faculty priorities for staff development; and (d) suggested methods for offering inservice activities. The committee offered recommendations for specific data to be collected relative to each domain.
2. A review of the literature on staff development, especially materials concerned with staff development for part-time faculty, influenced the content and structure of the questionnaire (Hoenninger and Black, 1978; Koltai, 1976; Lombardi, 1975; O'Banion, 1977, 1978 and others). A number of questionnaires developed for study of part-time faculty were reviewed (Davis, 1976; Hammons et al, 1978; Peterson,

1974; Raines, 1976; Schuetz and Roed, 1978). A study of the literature related to survey research was undertaken to review recommendations for question format and wording (Babbie, 1973; Oppenhein, 1966; Payne, 1951; Selltiz et al, 1959). A preliminary draft of the questionnaire was written, using these references and an outline of the specific information desired from the Vista faculty.

3. The first draft of the questionnaire was submitted to the advisory committee for critique. The suggestions of committee members were incorporated into a second draft.
4. In order to maximize validity in question wording, the second draft was analyzed by experts in questionnaire construction from the University of California Survey Research Center. Following their critique and consultation, a third draft of the questionnaire was written.
5. To enhance reliability, the questionnaire was pre-tested with fifteen part-time faculty volunteers. As the volunteers completed the questionnaire, they were asked to note any questions or instructions which lacked clarity. The final questionnaire, which was written based on the results of the pre-test, is included in Appendix B.
6. The questionnaire was coded for data processing.

Determination of the Population to be Surveyed

A search of the college's personnel records was made to determine the names and addresses of all faculty who had taught at the college from the Fall semester of 1976 through the Spring semester of 1979. It was discovered that 439 faculty had taught during this period.

Collection of Data

On May 8, 1979, a questionnaire and self-addressed, stamped, return envelope was mailed to 439 faculty. A two-week time period was allowed for return before follow-up procedures began. Between May 22 and May 29, a telephone follow-up was conducted. Up to three telephone calls were made to all who had not responded. Those who were reached were asked if they had received the questionnaire, and if so, would they please respond. If a respondent no longer had the questionnaire or did not recall receiving it, he/she was asked to respond to a second questionnaire. Those who agreed to respond were mailed a letter thanking them for help with the survey and a second questionnaire.

On June 6, all who had not been reached by telephone follow-up were sent a letter asking if they had the questionnaire, and if so, would they please respond. If they no longer had the questionnaire or did not recall receiving one, they were asked to call the college to request a second questionnaire. On June 7, a follow-up letter was sent to those who had agreed by telephone to respond, but who had not done so. Telephone and written follow-up activities were terminated on June 20.

Data Analysis

Three-hundred and seventeen questionnaires were returned. The data were analyzed with the help of a CDC 6400 computer, using a computerized program analysis titled Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The SPSS program tabulated faculty responses, determined relative proportions and calculated percentage distributions.

REVIEW OF PROJECT BY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Results of the three research components described above were reviewed by an expanded advisory committee composed of the President of Vista College, the Dean of Instruction, the Dean of Student Personnel Services and four faculty members assigned to program planning at the college. Two meetings were held where the committee members contributed to the recommendations for future faculty development activities at the college that are reported in Chapter V.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This chapter reports the findings of three components of the research project: (1) a study of faculty development activities at three noncampus community colleges; (2) a survey of materials and resources related to part-time faculty development; and (3) a survey of the faculty who had taught at Vista College during a three-year period.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES AT THREE NONCAMPUS COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Administrative staff at three noncampus colleges were interviewed and selected faculty development materials and techniques were observed during a one-year period from June 1978 to May 1979. The following three colleges were selected for study because each was a member of a multi-campus district and each was staffed primarily by part-time faculty: Pioneer Community College in Kansas City, Missouri; Coastline Community College in Fountain Valley, California, and Rio Salado Community College in Phoenix, Arizona. More specifically, college administrators at each location were asked (1) how the college provided inservice activities for its part-time faculty, (2) what materials were used for faculty development, and (3) what were the challenges and problems related to faculty development in a noncampus setting.

The following report of this on-site research includes sections that describe each of the colleges visited and the nature and duration of inservice activities that had been provided for part-time faculty. The final section summarizes the problems and challenges related to faculty development in a noncampus setting, as reported by the college administrators who were interviewed.

Pioneer Community College

Pioneer is one of four colleges of the Metropolitan Community College District, which serves the four counties of metropolitan Kansas City, Missouri. Pioneer was especially interesting because, of all the noncampus colleges observed, it was most like Vista College in organizational structure. In addition, the socioeconomic characteristics of the population of the Metropolitan Community College District and the Peralta Community College District were very similar. Both districts serve metropolitan areas where large numbers of minority and low-income populations are concentrated in a centralized area. During a March, 1979 visit to the college, information was obtained from Queen Randall, President, and Ashley Johnson, Dean of Instruction.

Characteristics. The college was established in 1976 to offer both credit and non-credit courses. By the 1978-79 academic year, 10,000 students were enrolled in both general and occupational education. The college served a geographic area of 400 square miles, and classes were offered in 80 different locations. About 300 classes were offered each semester. Classes were staffed by 23 full-time faculty, most of whom taught in the areas of developmental skills and business education, and between 150 and 200 part-time faculty. About 10 percent of the part-time faculty were contract staff from other colleges in the District.

Inservice Activities and Materials. The contents of a mimeographed faculty handbook and orientation handouts related primarily to college procedures and policy. These materials were provided to new faculty as they were hired throughout the academic year. No materials had been developed that related to the unique problems of teaching adults in the noncampus college structure.

At one time, the Office of Instruction held group orientation sessions for new faculty, but it was decided that the meetings were not working well. Consequently, heads of instructional programs then oriented new faculty individually when they were hired to teach.

Other than the initial orientation to teaching, no organized faculty development activities were offered specifically for the part-time faculty. Very few part-time faculty participated in district-wide staff development activities, such as two-day workshops. Administrators believed that part-time faculty did not attend extensive inservice activities for two specific reasons: (1) in addition to teaching, most part-timers worked elsewhere, which made attendance at a two-day function difficult; and (2) part-time faculty were not compensated for inservice activities, since they were paid only for the hours they taught.

Coastline Community College

Coastline Community College is one of three colleges of the Coast Community College District, which serves Orange County south of Los Angeles. During a May, 1979 visit, Edward Decker, Dean of Instruction, and Ron Berrgeron, Associate Dean of Occupational Education, contributed information about Coastline and its faculty development activities. Coastline was selected for observation and interviews for three reasons: (1) it had been established after two years of cooperative planning within the multi-college district; (2) staff had developed several unique organizational features and strong support systems which could be replicated in other noncampus colleges; and (3) the college had experienced a rapid growth pattern--it had attracted a phenomenal enrollment of 25,000 students in its three years of operation.

Characteristics. The college offered all the community-based classes that were provided within the 100 square mile geographic area of the district. To administer the instructional program, the district had been divided into four geographical areas. Each of the four areas contained a college center administered by an associate dean of instruction. Staff at each area center assessed the instructional needs of the local residents and businesses, planned curricula, and hired and evaluated faculty. Area center staff also provided faculty with instructional support services such as duplication of materials, ordering of textbooks, audio visual services, and internal/external mail service. Area associate deans worked with the Dean of Instruction to coordinate all course offerings across the four geographic areas. The internal administration systems of the Office of Instruction facilitated cooperation between the geographic areas. An excellent computer system was available to support administration of the extensive and complex instructional program of the college.

In the 1978-79 academic year, the college offered 1,400 classes in 126 locations, taught by 15 full-time faculty and 822 part-time faculty; and the college enrolled 360 full-time students and 19,000 part-time students. Coastline administrators expected that the college would continue to grow at the approximate rate of 15 percent per year.

Inservice Activities and Materials. Coastline's faculty development program included three types of activities: individual and group orientations for faculty in each area center, college-wide inservice workshops, and distribution of a monthly faculty newsletter. In addition, administrative staff were developing an extensive faculty evaluation system, and a portion of the college's part-time faculty were testing some new orientation materials.

Orientation sessions were provided each semester for faculty in each area center. A printed faculty handbook produced each semester and accompanied by a well-designed instructional services booklet was distributed to all faculty members. Area associate deans planned their own orientation sessions, which included meeting with individuals or group meetings with faculty.

College-wide faculty development activities were also offered each year. Two major activities took place in the Spring of 1979. The first was involvement in the Kellogg Project in Community College Education, which inspired a very successful faculty workshop. The workshop, "Expo Coastline Instructional Technique Faire," was planned by an associate dean who worked with eight part-time faculty to design and provide workshop sessions dealing with several important teaching and learning issues. The faire received excellent evaluations from the 500 faculty members who attended. The success of this workshop encouraged administrators to plan future college-wide faculty development activities of a similar nature.

Coastline's monthly newsletter featured information about development of the college, as well as articles related to teaching and learning. The newsletter was sent to all faculty and staff and to appropriate district-wide personnel. Over the two years of its publication, the newsletter had become a well-designed, professional medium of communication.

A faculty evaluation system was under development which, when complete, would contain four parts: student evaluation, administrative evaluation, peer evaluation, and self evaluation. The instruments for student and administrative evaluation were complete and a system for their administration was in place which included a computer program for tabulating responses. The peer evaluation and self evaluation instruments were being designed and tested. Eventually, faculty evaluation will be handled through the area centers so that the associate deans will be able to gain insight about the strengths and weaknesses of their individual faculty, as well as learn more about the collective needs of the faculty associated with each center. Information gathered about and from the faculty will be used to determine the topics to be emphasized in both area center and college-wide faculty development activities.

Another project in progress involved participation with other colleges in the development of individualized written orientation units for use by part-time faculty. Coastline had been chosen to field-test the units during the 1978-79 academic year. The units covered topics common to needs of part-time teachers; however, the series of units did not cover the specialized characteristics of a noncampus college and the related challenges of teaching older students in outreach locations. (See Appendix B, page 102).

Rio Salado Community College

Rio Salado Community College was the newest noncampus college visited. The college was established in the Spring of 1978 and began offering classes the following Fall semester. Contacts were made with administrative staff of Rio Salado while the college was in its preliminary planning stage and during its first year of operation, in order to study how administrators would define and implement a faculty development program in a new college in a large, multi-college district. Lionel Martinez, Dean of Instruction, was interviewed during a June, 1978 visit, and information about further development at the college was obtained in several telephone interviews during the 1978-79 academic year with Francine Hardaway, Coordinator of Faculty Development, and Joyce Elsner, Acting Dean of Instruction.

Rio Salado was the sixth college established in the Maricopa County Community College District. With headquarters in Phoenix, the District serves the metropolitan area and surrounding suburbs within a county comprised of 9,200 square miles. When Rio Salado was formed, it was designated as the noncampus college for the District. All classes which had previously been offered off-campus by the five campus-based colleges were assigned to the new college, and Rio Salado staff immediately began development of additional community-based instructional offerings.

Characteristics. The college was operational, offering both credit and noncredit classes, in the Fall semester of 1978. Within one year, 8,700 students had enrolled in Rio Salado classes that were taught in 150 locations by over 250 faculty. The faculty were almost all part-time, since only a small percentage (three percent) were full-time faculty at the other district colleges who taught extra service classes at Rio Salado. The organization of the college's instructional system, like Coastline, was characterized by five centers which served specific geographic areas.

Given the rapid growth of this college in a one-year period, providing faculty inservice activities had been difficult. Instructional administrators were developing faculty materials, but a handbook specifically for Rio Salado had not been completed. In the meantime, handbooks that had been prepared for full-time faculty teaching in the campus-based colleges were being used in individual and/or group orientation sessions for new and continuing faculty. Faculty orientation was handled by the area administrators.

During the first year of operation, Francine Hardaway was assigned the responsibility of developing faculty inservice activities, as one part of her administrative duties. She explored ways to develop policies, methods and procedures for faculty development. Research and discussion focused on familiar and important issues in providing inservice to noncampus, part-time faculty: what types of activities faculty would attend; how often to schedule activities; how to provide staff development other than in workshops; how to pay people for attending workshops; and how to get part-timers more involved in faculty development activities.

During Rio Salado's first academic year (1978-79), three faculty development strategies were pilot tested: orientation sessions at area centers, area-sponsored workshops on specific instructional techniques, and the publication of a faculty newsletter.

Orientation sessions were handled by individual area administrators, who arranged for group and individual meetings with faculty assigned to their areas. All faculty were given packages of information about college procedures. One college-wide workshop was attended by only

20 people. Although evaluations of the workshop were positive, administrators inferred that only a small percentage of faculty would participate without compensation.

Three workshops were held in area centers which concentrated on specific instructional strategies such as classroom management and designing instructional materials. These workshops were coordinated by the faculty development administrator but designed and led by other Rio Salado administrators or visiting consultants. In one case, the workshop was part of the area orientation session; in two other cases workshops were held at convenient, nonacademic times. Faculty (20) who attended one workshop were paid at substitute rates; the other two workshops were volunteer activities and were attended by very few faculty.

In addition to the orientation sessions and workshops, a newsletter titled "Update" was published approximately once a month. The newsletter contained information about the development of college programs, staff activities and teaching/learning issues. All part-time faculty and the college staff received copies of "Update."

During the 1979-80 academic year, area centers will continue to orient faculty, and the college's faculty development efforts may be expanded to include radio broadcasts related to teaching and learning issues. The college operates an FM radio station which may be used to reach faculty who are scattered over the college's large geographic area. This radio project would be operated either as open broadcasts at times when faculty could listen in their homes, or as a sub-carrier process where broadcasts would be heard through a special receiver placed in area centers (or other central locations). For this second method, faculty would be asked to be present at designated locations at a specific time in order to participate in an interactive broadcast and conference.

Summary of Problems and Challenges

Administrators of all three colleges studied reported that the organization and delivery of inservice activities for part-time faculty was especially problematic in the noncampus setting. Each administrator interviewed acknowledged the necessity of delivering appropriate, consistent inservice activities to their part-time staff, but each administrator also identified several major obstacles to their efforts in the faculty development area. After numerous interviews and observations, it was apparent that a similar pattern of faculty development problems existed in all three colleges studied. More specifically, three kinds of problems contributed to faculty development challenges at these noncampus colleges; the physical isolation of faculty who often worked full-time elsewhere; the complex logistical problems associated with delivering appropriate activities to large numbers of faculty who were scattered over large geographic areas; and the scarcity of faculty development funding, administrative personnel and materials.

Faculty isolation is a distinguishing characteristic of the noncampus college. When part-time faculty are the total faculty cohort, and if they teach in scattered locations, there is no central "college environment" with which they can identify. Identification with "a college," often an important factor for faculty, does not exist. It was the opinion of administrators that many faculty, especially those who have nonacademic full-time occupations, do not desire or need a strong identification or attachment to the college. However, administrators reported that other faculty--a variable percentage of the total--seemed to desire some sort of regular contact in order to feel that they are a part of something more than teaching a small group of students in a community location. These faculty wished to have more contact with teaching peers and college staff.

All of the colleges recognized that one way to contact all faculty, and provide everyone with the same information, was through a newsletter. A newsletter system was in various stages of development in all colleges studied; Coastline had the most well-developed regular publication. There was interest in experimentation with the content of a noncampus college newsletter. The existing newsletters emphasized information about college activities and program development, with brief coverage of actual teaching and learning issues. An interesting challenge for newsletter editors was to consider how to include (or if to include) teaching and learning information in the newsletters.

Another strategy used to reduce isolation in two of the colleges studied was the decentralization of administration services through the creation of area centers. This method was chosen by the two districts which covered large geographic areas. Through a decentralized organizational structure, faculty were able to identify with a place and communicate with staff for orientation and instructional services. These area centers were "home base" where faculty could meet students, administrators, and other faculty.

The logistics of offering effective inservice activities to faculty who were teaching day, night and on Saturdays in 150-200 locations scattered over a large geographic area was reported to be a major challenge. The colleges were trying various ways to reach faculty by offering both college-wide activities and specialized workshops or seminars. The colleges studied had experienced variable success with these activities. Administrators recognized that, beyond an initial orientation to teaching, that it would probably not be possible to ever get all part-time faculty to attend any one event. However, they attached high priority to finding ways to organize and deliver workshop/seminars that were attractive to their part-time faculty.

Funding for faculty development was a two dimensional problem. First, paying faculty for attending inservice activities was a problem. In all the colleges studied, part-time faculty were paid only for the hours they taught. Administrators recognized that part-time faculty were generally paid at a low rate for the services they provided. In addition to teaching, faculty members in noncampus colleges often handle the registration procedures, are required to complete considerable other paperwork, and counsel students. Asking faculty to volunteer time for inservice activities was recognized as a sensitive issue. Administrators interviewed had a high level of appreciation for the efforts of their part-time faculty and were reluctant to ask them to perform duties far beyond their teaching roles. Administrators were dismayed that they had no means of compensation for part-time faculty who were interested in faculty development activities.

The second part of the funding problem had to do with need for personnel and support for comprehensive, consistent faculty development activities. Adequate funding was unavailable in all three colleges studied. All administrators expressed the desire to have a systematized faculty development program within their noncampus organizational structure, but none had been able to assign a full-time staff person to these activities. Administrators reported that faculty development wouldn't "just happen" in the context of the immediate priorities of the day-to-day operational aspects of a noncampus college. All considered it important to develop the appropriate administrative funding that would result in a comprehensive faculty development program.

Administrators also reported scarcity of materials for part-time faculty development. Each administrator expressed the need for materials specifically related to teaching and learning in the noncampus college structure. Printed and audio-visual materials used in the colleges studied were very similar to those developed for traditional campus-based colleges; none of the colleges had developed materials specific to teaching adults in the noncampus outreach mode.

Despite all the problems associated with providing inservice activities for part-time faculty in these noncampus colleges, administrators were surprisingly enthusiastic, committed and optimistic about continuing to improve their present efforts. The administrators stated that the provision of organized faculty development activities should be a regular component of noncampus college operations--not just an "added on" activity. The administrators were strongly committed to finding creative ways to institutionalize faculty development in their college structures. Even though budget cuts and lack of support for faculty development activities were a reality, the attitudes of administrators seemed to be "we will forge ahead and make the college work in spite of set backs... we will figure out a way to do it."

REVIEW OF MATERIALS AND RESOURCES RELATED TO PART-TIME FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

A review of the print and audio-visual resources in the faculty development area revealed that there was a wealth of materials available, most of which had been designed for a full-time faculty audience. Many of the materials surveyed were judged to be most appropriate (but not limited) to full-time faculty because the materials, instructional techniques and/or administrative strategies used were dependent on the assumption that the typical faculty learner was teaching students of conventional college age in an institution that contained a fairly conventional, familiar set of instructional and student service resources. Materials oriented toward full-time faculty also assumed that the faculty learner had a strong attachment to the college and did not have nonacademic occupational responsibilities that strongly competed with teaching responsibilities.

It was found that some materials had been developed specifically for adjunct faculty who taught a class or two, usually in evening programs, in campus based colleges. These materials emphasized college policies and procedures as well as inservice training in various instructional techniques. However, no materials were located which had been designed for part-time faculty teaching adults in noncampus settings.

From the resources surveyed, those considered useful for the development of future inservice activities at Vista College were selected and then organized into six categories: (1) publications that described the content and organization of faculty development at other community colleges; (2) periodicals related to faculty development; (3) publications related to teaching and learning; (4) resources at other nearby institutions; (5) self-instructional learning modules; and (6) video tape materials. An annotated bibliography of these selected materials is presented in Appendix A.

Several useful publications were found which described how faculty development activities had been provided in community colleges. Some described a yearly schedule of faculty workshops or seminars. Others gave outlines of comprehensive orientation courses for part-time instructors. For example, a publication of the Maricopa Community College District described the course content of 13 seminars for part-time occupational instructors. A Seminole Community College document outlined the contents of a 15-hour workshop for new adjunct faculty, with materials that emphasized the role of the instructor, teaching and learning interface, teaching strategies, instructional aids and evaluation of instruction.

No periodicals were located which concentrated only on faculty development for part-timers. However, three excellent newsletters were found which had been designed for faculty development in community colleges: quarterly publication, "Faculty Development and Evaluation Newspaper," edited by Albert B. Smith, and "Linkages" and "Abstracts," which were published by the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development. These publications contained information about national faculty development activities, research reports on faculty development, and specific information about the improvement of teaching. The concise, attractive, and stimulating style of these publications made them particularly appropriate for part-time faculty.

Several books were located which offered both learning theory information and practical suggestions for teaching. Especially pertinent were two books which were written for beginning teachers. A Manual for Teaching Assistants (Bernstein, 1975), while written for graduate and undergraduate teaching assistants, was found to be particularly beneficial for part-time instructors who have had limited training and/or experience in teaching. Teaching Tips: A Guidebook for the Beginning Teacher (McKeachie, 1951) was also judged to be an important resource for inexperienced faculty. Other teaching and learning resources located emphasized the adult learner and appropriate teaching strategies. Additional publications in this category trained teachers to set instructional goals, prepare objectives and measure instructional intent.

After investigating resources at other institutions, it was determined that two nearby institutions provided faculty development services which would be valuable to Vista College staff. San Jose State University operated an Institutional Resource Center where self-instructional learning modules and consultant services were available to staff from neighboring colleges. In addition, it was found that the Teaching Innovation and Evaluation Services (TIES) at the University of California, Berkeley also offered consultation services and materials developed at the center to staff from local community colleges.

As a result of review of self-instructional learning modules which had been developed for part-time faculty and for new community college teachers, it was found that modules had been produced on a variety of topics common to community college teaching. The content of modules recently developed by the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development (Media Systems Corporation, 1979) was judged especially good, and it is anticipated that the format of these modules will be attractive to part-time faculty.

One individualized module was located which was directed toward part-time faculty who were teaching older adult students.

"An Introduction to Continuing Education" (Fellows, 1975) acquaints faculty with contemporary concepts related to adult education and adult learners, and includes suggestions for appropriate teaching strategies. No individualized modules were located which had been written specifically about the characteristics of teaching in a non-campus "community outreach" institution.

Video tapes as resource material for faculty development proved to be somewhat scarce. Two taped series were found which illustrated styles of lecturing, characteristics of young student learners, using media with nonreaders, and testing and evaluation. One segment was available which covered the history and characteristics of the community college in California. These tapes were oriented toward the full-time faculty member in a campus-based college. While the content of the tapes had value, they were judged to have limited use for part-time faculty teaching in a noncampus institution, since the tapes primarily picture faculty working with young adult students in typical college classroom settings.

RESULTS OF VISTA COLLEGE FACULTY SURVEY

Of the 439 faculty who had taught at Vista College during the three-year period studied, 31 faculty no longer resided in the San Francisco Bay area. Consequently, the survey questionnaire (Appendix B) was sent to a total of 408 faculty. Questionnaires were returned by 77.7 percent (317) of this group. Uncompleted questionnaires were returned by 18 faculty, which signified that they were not interested in future teaching at Vista. Therefore, the results of the study reported here are based on the responses of the 299 faculty members (73 percent of the group of 408) who returned completed questionnaires.

The terms faculty and respondents refer to this group of 299 faculty throughout the survey results.

The following report of the responses to the faculty survey is presented in three sections that parallel the organization of the questionnaire items: (1) description and characteristics of Vista faculty, (2) faculty perceptions of teaching at Vista, and (3) faculty opinions about staff development activities.

Description and Characteristics of Vista College Faculty

A total of 14 questionnaire items elicited responses that resulted in a demographic profile of the respondents.

Educational Background. Over two-thirds of the respondents had advanced degrees: 57.2 percent held master's degrees, and 11.7 percent held doctoral degrees. Nearly one-fourth of the faculty held only bachelor's degrees. Faculty in this group held a community college credential which required a bachelor's degree and a minimum of two years of work experience related to a discipline/program area. Less than 10 percent did not have postsecondary degrees. This group included faculty who held community college "eminence credentials," which recognize outstanding achievement in a field, and faculty who held "limited service credentials," which require a minimum of six years of work experience in a specific vocational area.

Table 1

Frequency Distribution of Educational Background of Faculty (N 299)

Degree	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
Less than BA/BS	21	7.0%
BA/BS	72	24.1%
MA/MS	171	57.2%
Ph.D.	35	11.7%

Age Distribution. Over half the faculty were between the ages of 30 and 50 (62 percent). More were between age 50 and 70 (32.1%) than were under age 30 (24.1%).

Table 2

Frequency Distribution of Age of Faculty (N 299)

Age	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
Less than 25 years	2	.7%
25-29	35	11.7%
30-39	114	38.1%
40-49	72	24.1%
50-59	48	16.1%
60-69	18	6.0%
70 or older	3	1.0%
No answer	7	2.3%

Gender Distribution. The sexes were almost equally represented; 51.5 percent were female, and 48.5 percent were male.

Ethnicity. Most respondents (75 percent) were Caucasian, with 11 percent Black, four percent Asian and one percent American Indian. Five percent of the respondents listed themselves as "other" (eight

Chicano and six European), and four percent did not answer. When asked if they were of Spanish, Mexican or Latin descent in a subsequent question, seven percent of all respondents (22) said "yes."

Language Fluency. Because the college was extending outreach efforts into various ethnic communities, faculty were asked if they were fluent in languages other than English. It was found that 30 percent (89) were fluent in the following languages:

Language	Number of Faculty	Language	Number of Faculty
Spanish	47	Russian	2
French	38	Armenian	2
German	11	Turkish	2
American Sign Language	6	Korean	1
Chinese	5	Swiss	1
Italian	5	Greek	1
Swedish	3	Finnish	1
Portuguese	2	Hebrew	1
Norwegian	2	Dutch	1
Danish	2	Latin	1
		Swahili	1

Teaching Areas of Respondents. Almost half the respondents were teaching general education and humanities classes, with the other half almost equally distributed between business and human service classes. Distribution of respondents teaching in programmatic/discipline areas of the college are summarized as follows:

Programmatic Area	Percentage
General Education (including humanities)	42.8%
Business, Management, Transportation	24.4%
Human Services	22.4%
Disabled Students Program	7.4%
Alternative Technology and Environmental Studies	3.0%

History of Faculty Teaching at Vista College. The respondents were asked to designate which semesters they had taught at the college. As shown in Table 3, responses reflected the growth of the college from 31 faculty members in the Fall semester of 1976 to 179 members by Spring semester of 1979.

Table 3

Frequency Distribution of Faculty Teaching Experience at Vista College (N 299)

Semester	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
Fall 1976	31	10.4%
Spring 1977	51	17.1%
Fall 1977	86	28.8%
Spring 1978	152	50.8%
Fall 1978	169	56.5%
Spring 1979	179	59.9%

Part and Full-Time Faculty Status. Looking at the comparison of full-time and part-time faculty, it was found that 11 percent of the 299 respondents (33) were employed full-time in the Peralta District. The primary teaching assignment for 27 members of this group was at other colleges in the District. They taught one or two courses at Vista as an extra service assignment or as a part of their contract. In this category, two faculty had their primary teaching assignment at the College of Alameda, 15 at Laney College and 10 at Merritt College. Vista had six full-time faculty.

Prior Teaching Experience of Full-Time Faculty. Almost all the 33 full-time faculty were experienced teachers. More than 12 years of full-time teaching experience was reported by 19 faculty, seven to 12 years of teaching by eight faculty, and three to six years of teaching by seven faculty. Only two full-time faculty members had two years or less teaching experience.

Prior Teaching Experience of Part-Time Faculty. The survey indicated that 89 percent (231) of the 266 part-time faculty had taught before coming to Vista. In terms of postsecondary education, most faculty reported part-time (124) or full-time (29) teaching in community colleges or in four-year institutions (77 had taught part-time and 28 had taught full-time). Others had taught in high schools (42 had taught full-time, 32 had taught part-time) or in adult education (9). As summarized in Table 4, results showed that some faculty had experience teaching adults in a variety of other educational settings. They had taught in government or industry, in private specialty schools (such as language institutes, business schools, art schools, and religious institutions), as well as in hospitals and human service agencies. In addition, some faculty had full or part-time experience teaching in public schools--preschool through junior high school.

Table 4

Range of Prior Teaching Experience of Part-Time Faculty (N 231)

Kind of Institution or Program	Number of Faculty Having Experience		Range of Years of Experience
Community or Junior College	full-time	29	1-10
	part-time	124	1-15
Four Year College or University	full-time	28	1-20
	part-time	77	1-11
High School	full-time	42	1-14
	part-time	32	1-10
Adult School (High School)	full-time	9	1-16
	part-time	43	1-13
Preschool, Elementary or Junior High	full-time	27	1-14
	part-time	11	5-9
Military, Government or Industry	full-time	19	1-10
	part-time	14	3-7
Hospitals or Human Service Related Education	full-time	6	2-6
	part-time	20	1-16
Private Specialty Schools (Art, Language, Religion, Special Education)	full-time	9	1-10
	part-time	15	1-25

Academic Preparation of Part-Time Faculty for Community College Teaching. Most part-time faculty had no formal preparation for teaching adults and very few had studied the community college in context of higher education. Courses in college teaching methods had been taken by 34 percent of the respondents and 13 percent had taken a course dealing with the characteristics/nature of the community college.

Part-Time Faculty Employment in Addition to Teaching at Vista. As anticipated, most part-time faculty were employed elsewhere. Full-time employment in the following occupational roles was reported by 40 percent of the faculty (120); part-time employment was reported by 34.4 percent (103).

Faculty Occupations	Number Full-Time (N 120)	Number Part-Time (N 103)
Business or Management	59	22
Teaching	20	42
Human Services	17	29
Government Service	7	0
Artist	3	7
Attorney	4	1
Research	4	1
Landscape Design	2	1
Musician	2	0
Carpentry	1	0
Fireman	1	0

Reasons Given for Teaching by Part-Time Faculty. A majority of the part-time faculty said they taught because of enjoyment, personal growth and opportunity to help others, instead of for monetary reasons. The frequency of responses given for why instructors teach is further illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5

Range of Reasons Given for Teaching by Part-Time Faculty (N 266)

Question: There are many different reasons why a person may teach in a community college. For each reason below, please check one answer to show how much that factor has to do with why you teach.

	A most important reason I teach.	An important reason, but not the most important reason I teach.	A reason, but not an important reason I teach.	Not a reason I teach.	Did not ans.
	N	N	N	N	N
Because I enjoy teaching	225	37	4	0	0
Because teaching is a high status occupation	6	32	81	133	14
Because I really need the money to live on	38	57	74	88	9
Because I like having the extra income	33	71	81	61	20
Because of the personal/intellectual growth I gain from teaching	180	69	12	5	0
Because I like helping others	168	77	15	5	1

A Comparison of Teaching Income With Other Sources of Part-Time Faculty. When part-time faculty were asked how much of their total income was derived from teaching, 39 percent indicated less than 10 percent. Table 6 shows that 63.1 percent said that they derived 25 percent or less of their total income from teaching. Only 8.3 percent indicated that their sole source of income was from part-time teaching at Vista.

Table 6

Frequency Distribution of Income Derived From Part-Time Teaching (N 266)

Amount of Income Derived From Part-Time Teaching	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
Less than 10%	102	38.3%
10%-24%	64	24.1%
25%-49%	25	9.4%
50%-74%	27	10.1%
75%-99%	18	6.8%
100%	22	8.3%
Did not answer	8	3.0%

Interest of Part-Time Faculty in Teaching Full-Time. Responses from 84 percent of the part-time faculty (244) indicated that if the option of full-time teaching were offered, less than half of the faculty (43.8 percent) would choose to teach full-time. To remain a part-time instructor was preferred by 40.5 percent of the respondents.

Faculty Perceptions of Teaching at Vista College

Thirteen questionnaire items asked faculty to characterize their likes and dislikes related to teaching at Vista, as well as their perceptions of the college and its students.

Extent of Faculty Agreement With College Objectives. The faculty were asked to state the extent to which they were in agreement with the objectives outlined in the mission statement of the college. Responses tabulated in Table 7 indicate that the faculty were in strong agreement with each of the objectives. Well over half indicated that they thought each of the objectives appropriate, and very few expressed strong disagreement.

Table 7

Extent of Faculty Agreement With College Objectives (N 299)

Question: The mission statement lists the following specific objectives for the college. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each as an appropriate objective for the college? Please check one answer for each.

	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	No Opinion	Disagree Somewhat	Strongly Disagree	No Ans.
	N	N	N	N	N	N
To offer education in four broad areas: Business, Alternative Technology & Environmental Management, Human Services and General Studies	189	80	11	8	1	10
To offer learning experiences at different times and places using a variety of teaching methods	248	36	7	1	1	6
To provide counseling and assistance to adults in group and individual settings	168	87	29	7	0	8
To involve the community in assessing educational needs and identifying new students	193	74	23	3	0	6
To focus college resources on community problems	179	79	21	11	2	7

Faculty Perceptions of Why Students Enroll at Vista. From five reasons, respondents were asked to choose the two main reasons for student enrollment in their classes. It was the opinion of faculty that the most frequent reason students enrolled was for general or continuing education, and the least frequent reason students enrolled was to complete an AA degree.

Reason Students Enroll	Frequence of Response
For general interest (continuing education)	195
To improve present job skills (inservice)	151
Job seeking, looking for new work, or to change work	82
To complete AA degree requirements, or to take courses to transfer to four year college	57
Other reasons	80

Under "other reasons," eighty faculty volunteered a variety of reasons for student enrollment in their classes. Some faculty (25) said that students wanted to learn a specific skill. Examples of specific skills included reading, English or another language, study skills, money management, communication skills, and specific work-related skills like automotive repair and interpreter training. Others (20) mentioned personal development as a student objective; these faculty speculated that students had enrolled to gain self-understanding, to gain self-esteem, to improve interpersonal skills, and/or to improve the quality of life. Additional reasons given were:

Other Reasons Students Enroll	Frequency of Response
To find a creative outlet in art, music, writing	9
To meet new people	8
To obtain continuing education credit or a certificate	6
To fulfill employer requirements	3
Because it is low cost or no cost	3
Vista is the only college where class is offered	2
Convenience of TV classes and/or studying at home	1

Faculty Opinions About the Difference Between Vista Students and Students on a College Campus. The faculty were asked to give their opinions about how students in a noncampus college are different from students who attend campus-based community colleges. Respondents did not see any dramatic difference between the groups, but the question elicited a high level of response. The greatest difference expressed concerned how hard students work. Of the 196 faculty who said they had taught in campus-based community colleges, 58 percent (114) said that students in outreach classes worked harder at learning tasks than students on campus, while 32 percent (63) were neutral and only nine percent (19) disagreed.

Faculty also identified differences in terms of student skills and backgrounds. Students in outreach classes were thought to have better reading skills, to be more verbal, and generally better educated than students on campus by 85 respondents. However, 57 faculty were neutral about this difference and 54 faculty disagreed. Very little difference was seen in relation to students' questioning skills, creative thinking ability, or in how students criticized the teaching methods of faculty.

Although there were no striking differences shown in response to this question, many respondents (124) wrote in comments about how they thought students in community-based classes were different from those who enroll on a college campus. The largest number of faculty (33) said that students attended Vista classes for general interest and personal or professional growth rather than to complete educational requirements. Some typical comments were as follows:

> "Interested in subject rather than in degree."
>
> "Know exactly what they want...don't want time wasted on irrelevant material."
>
> "Are clear about reasons for taking a class."
>
> "Motivation more inward, less concern for credit, grades, degrees, more for learning."
>
> "More pragmatic...want what is useful. Less patient with intellectual bullshit."

Other faculty (21) included comments on their perception of student motivation and goal orientation.

> "Students are more definite about life's objectives."
>
> "They are mature adults with knowledge and experience in adult roles. Time is precious to them and they value learning."
>
> "They are highly motivated and 'older makes them wiser'."
>
> "The community-based students are attempting to claim the present--this makes them, in my experience, generally better motivated than younger students who are 'required' to take English 1A or Physics 10."
>
> "The students attend because of general interest; as a consequence, the learning environment was charged with electricity."

> "In my experience in the general education program is that students have a high interest and follow-through."

Comments were made by 10 faculty which described the students as learners.

> "They are more self directed--want to design their own program."

> "They can be encouraged more not just to please the teacher, but to develop their own ideas and directions."

> "The level of problem solving ability and creative thinking seems higher in the community-based classes. Maybe it is because older adults are more secure and are willing to risk more."

On the other hand, 18 faculty expressed their concern and frustration about students who dropped out and/or did not complete class requirements.

> "Problems on the job and family pressures influence class attendance and performance."

> "If they do not see relationships between class content and their lives, they drop."

> "Motivation is very extreme in foreign language classes. Either students are very motivated--more than university students--or, they give up early and need a lot more counsel and coaxing."

> "They are less used to studying--study skills are poorer, more outside pressures of job and family."

> "Older students are less willing to do homework."

A few (4) faculty said that students were not that different from those found on a college campus.

> "Not that different, older students are enrolling on campus."

> "Aside from age factors and experience in the job market, the differences are not that noticeable among business students. Both types of students usually have a goal they are trying to reach within their own limitations."

One person commented about differences in students depending on the community location where classes are taught.

> "Students are different depending on the community location. For example, students at the Lawrence Lab at the University of California are very different from those at the county hospital. It requires the teacher to be flexible."

Faculty Teaching Methods. Faculty were asked to describe their primary method of teaching. When asked to select one statement which best described the way they taught most of the time, over half of the faculty said they combined lecture with discussion. About one-fourth said they combined lecture with laboratory. The following list summarizes responses to this item:

Method	Frequency
Lecture and discussion	53.5%
Lecture and laboratory	22.7%
Individualized learning laboratory	6.7%
Discussion mainly	6.4%
Independent study and television	1.5%
Lecture, little or no discussion	1.0%
Other	8.0%

Descriptions of other teaching methods were written in by 24 respondents, most of whom (21) said they combined three methods--lecture, discussion and laboratory. Laboratory techniques included experiential learning activities such as roleplay and sociodrama, as well as group projects and model building. Two respondents said they used the case study method in teaching technical writing; two used audio lingual drill methods in language courses, and three said they taught through field trips combining observation, discussion and lecture.

Effectiveness of Orientation to Teaching. Faculty were asked to give their opinions about their initial orientation to teaching at Vista. They were asked to say whether or not they had received adequate orientation in five areas. Most respondents said they received adequate guidance about registration (82 percent) and attendance reporting procedures (80 percent). Over half (65 percent) said that adequate guidance was given about grading procedures. Two areas of orientation were poorly rated. Only 35 percent said they had received enough information about payroll procedures, and only 27 percent said they had been given enough information about counseling services available to students.

Opinions About Instructional Support Services. A series of questionnaire items addressed the extent to which faculty were using four instructional services and their opinions about service quality.

1. Duplication of Materials. Over half of the respondents (56 percent) had used the duplication services. Among those who had not used this service, 19 (6.4 percent) said they were unaware of its existence. When users rated the quality of the duplication services, 70 percent said that this service was adequate or more than adequate; the remainder (30 percent) said it was inadequate.

2. Help From Staff Planners. About half of the respondents (46 percent) had received teaching assistance from instructional planners on the college staff. The others either said they had not needed help (31 percent), or that they were unaware that instructional assistance was available (23 percent). Of the 138 faculty who had received assistance from planners, over half (74) said that planners had been very helpful; 49 said they had been somewhat helpful, and 15 said that planners had not been helpful.

3. Audio Visual Services. Slightly less than half the respondents (46 percent) had used audio visual equipment. These respondents were asked to indicate specific equipment they had used. Projectors for 16mm films were used most often; slide projectors were next in order followed by audio recorders, overhead projectors and video recorders. Users were asked if there was ever a time they wanted to use equipment and had not done so. Over half of the respondents (78) said yes, and they offered several reasons why they had not used the equipment:

Reason For Not Using Audio Visual Equipment	Number of Respondents
It was too much trouble to take the equipment to the site	40
Equipment wasn't available when requested	21
Couldn't get films or tapes needed	14
Staff person not available to provide equipment	12
Used equipment available at site	7
Didn't have enough information about procedures for using equipment	6
Other	9

Respondents (54 percent) who had not used audio visual services were asked why. The most frequent reason was because audio visual presentations were not appropriate for their classes (mentioned by 56 respondents). Others reported that it was too much trouble to take equipment to sites (33) or they did not know equipment was available (22) Many respondents (24) had used equipment available at the site location or their own equipment (7). Only 2 faculty said they had not used equipment because they did not know how to operate it.

4. Textbooks. Over half (178 or 60 percent) of the respondents had used textbooks. An equal number of respondents (61) had made their own arrangements with a local bookstore to provide texts or had obtained books through Vista using the other Peralta College bookstores (61). The various other ways that faculty had found to obtain books included:

Other Methods for Obtaining Textbooks	Frequency
Sent students out on their own to find books	45
Agency where class was taught provided books free of charge or made arrangements to sell books at site	19
Made arrangements with publisher to come to class and sell books	6
When text not available for short term classes, instructors duplicated necessary text material	8
Teacher provided books to students, library books or their own books	5

Those respondents who had not used texts numbered 115. They were asked why texts had not been used in their classes. The most frequent reason given by respondents (75) was that textbooks were not appropriate for their classes. Other reasons fell into the following categories:

Other Reasons for Not Using Textbooks	Frequency
Text not available for subject	10
Handouts or other varied materials were more appropriate than one book	9
Preferred to use a text, but there was not enough time to order	7
Preferred using bibliography for students to obtain books from library	6
Cost of text too prohibitive	5
Other	3

Suggestions About How Support Staff Could Make Teaching Easier or More Productive. Respondents were asked an open ended question about what else the staff could do to support teaching. Over half the respondents (62 percent) wrote comments, a sampling of which appears below:

Categories of Responses	Frequency
Organization	17
* Coordinate schedule better * Work harder with site coordinators * Staff are so rushed they did not help * Less staff turnover in the office might help * Return phone calls and messages * Print schedule correctly	
Procedures	14
* Simplify paperwork * Simplify and improve registration	

Categories of Responses	Frequency
Instructional Services	14
* Pick up and deliver audio visual equipment	
* Improve duplication	
* Arrange for parking	
Teaching and Learning	14
* Reduce isolation	
* Create a mechanism for teachers to share common problems	
* Call more often to see how our classes are going	
* Visit classes more often	
* Help with grading problems	
*Give more counseling on teaching methods	
Payroll	6
* Let instructors know in advance in writing how much they are getting paid, and when to expect payment	
Positive Comments	9
* "You're doing fine...can't think of anything else you can do."	
* "Continue giving vital support to instructors."	
* "The staff is doing a great job."	
* "I don't know...I have been very happy with the past responses that I've received from my planner and others. Very much satisfied with the present operation."	

How Faculty Have Liked Teaching. When asked, "In general, how have you liked teaching at Vista?," most faculty (91 percent) replied favorably.

Table 8

Frequency Distribution of Faculty Feeling Toward Teaching (N 299)

How Faculty Liked Teaching	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
Liked teaching very well	233	74.6%
Liked teaching fairly well	50	16.7%
Liked it a little	3	1.0%
Did not like it at all	1	.3%
Did not answer	22	7.4%

Respondents were asked to comment about what they liked most about teaching. A large number (226) wrote in comments, most of which had to do with seeing students progress and the opportunity to interact with adult students from diverse backgrounds. The second most mentioned positive aspect of teaching was the opportunity for faculty to take responsibility for their courses and to teach in ways they judged best. Comments about the teaching process were grouped in the following manner:

Categories of Responses	Number of Responses
Seeing students progress	131
Freedom to teach as one wishes	76
Staff support and cooperation	54
Varied and interesting students	26

Categories of Responses	Number of Responses
Flexibility in planning and scheduling	22
Other (a sampling of comments):	12
"Openness, students, staff... everything."	
"Good advertising of classes."	
"I learned how to be clear and teach better."	
"Learning new ways to teach."	
"Vista does not say 'no'."	
"I am absolutely committed to what Vista is doing."	
"Meeting with other faculty."	

Faculty Dislikes About Teaching. A large number of respondents (223) also commented on what they disliked about teaching. Dislikes reiterated most of the same points made in a previous question which asked what staff could do to make teaching easier. Dislikes centered around administrative practices, problems associated with the noncampus structure and instructional support services. The single most mentioned dislike had to do with payroll procedures; 49 faculty expressed dissatisfaction about not being paid on time and not knowing how much or when one could expect to be paid. A small number of comments had to do with the actual teaching process. Comments are summarized as follows:

Categories of Responses	Frequency
Dislikes About Administrative Practices	124 (total)
* Payroll problems	49
* Paperwork and bureaucratic procedures (registration, attendance reporting, personnel forms, out of district permits)	45

Categories of Responses	Frequency
* No parking or office space provided	10
* No payment for preparation, travel, inservice activities	10
* Limit on number of hours part-time faculty can teach	4
* Low rate of hourly pay	6
Dislikes Associated with Noncampus Structure	80 (total)
* Problems at site location	24
* Sense of isolation of faculty	19
* Disorganization around scheduling of classes	13
* Having to help with recruitment and publicity	10
* Inconvenience of teaching hours	9
* Having to travel long distances	5
Dislikes Associated with Instructional Support	35 (total)
* Having to transport equipment or lack of equipment	17
* Inadequacy of duplication of service	8
* Inadequate budget for instructional materials	5
* Problems with textbooks	5
Dislikes Associated with the Teaching Process	15 (total)
* Lack of clarification of goals for class and expected course content	5
* Lack of help with teaching methods and evaluation	7
* Disappointment over students who drop classes	3
No Expressions of Dislikes	11 (total)
* "Have no dislikes, have nothing to complain about."	

This question produced a dichotomy of responses which indicated the spectrum of differences of opinion among faculty. This point is illustrated by the following comments which presented opposing points of view:

> "Nothing disliked...most satisfactory relationship in my broad experience, faculty are treated like people rather than statistics."

> "There was absolutely no emphasis on whether anybody learned anything or what would help in the education process. The only thing that seemed to matter was the number of bodies and whether or not the class carried."

Faculty Opinions About Staff Development Activities

In four items, faculty were asked to indicate their interest in several kinds of inservice activities, and the final, open-ended item of the questionnaire encouraged faculty to comment on teaching at Vista or any other problem/area that they thought worthy of mention.

Priority Topics for Faculty Inservice Activities. Respondents were asked to rank 13 inservice topics in order of priority. The five top priority topics selected were (1) retention, (2) how adults learn, (3) how to become a more effective teacher, (4) teacher evaluation, and (5) development of the instructional program. As shown in Table 9, the low priority topics had to do with grading, paperwork for the college, and how to write examination questions.

Respondents were encouraged to write in other topics they considered high priority for faculty workshops or meetings. Suggestions made by 41 respondents are listed on page 70.

Table 9

Percentage Distribution of Priority Topics for Faculty Inservice Activities (N 299)

Topics	High Priority	Relevant, But Not High Priority	Not Needed, Can't Decide or Did Not Answer
	%	%	%
Retention (ways to keep students in class once they enroll).	44.8	32.4	22.8
How adults learn and appropriate ways to teach them.	41.5	40.8	17.7
Programs on how to become a more effective teacher (lecturer, discussion group leader)	39.1	41.2	19.7
Teacher evaluation (i.e., how to know whether or not we are doing a good job of teaching).	38.8	42.5	18.7
Development of the instructional program at Vista.	38.5	35.4	26.1
New teaching methods (such as computer based instruction, television, methods for individualization).	33.4	42.3	24.3
How to make optimal use of learning resources (AV, other learning aids).	30.1	48.5	21.4
How to design student evaluation methods other than written examinations.	27.1	48.1	24.8
Discussion of the nature and mission of the college.	21.7	44.9	33.4
How to write course objectives, outlines and planning for course content.	20.7	43.8	35.5
Grading. Issues and solutions when adults enroll for different reasons.	17.1	44.8	38.1
Paperwork for college (registration, attendance, grading, etc.).	15.7	48.5	35.8
How to write examination questions.	9.7	40.4	49.9

Other Priorities for Faculty Inservice Activities	Number of Responses
Discipline discussions. Specific program topics related to Vista program development.	18
The current job market and its relationship to counseling students.	6
Publicity and recruitment, how to do effective outreach.	4
Sharing instructional methods and ideas.	3
Proposal writing.	2
Relationship of Vista to other Peralta Colleges.	2

Interest in Serving on Advisory Committees. When asked if they would be interested in serving on advisory committees, faculty responded in the following manner:

Advisory Committee	Absolute Frequency
Instructional Planning and Development	138
Planning Inservice Activities	78
Evaluation of Instruction	72
Development of a Faculty Senate	58

Recommendations for the Best Ways to Communicate With the Faculty. From eight ways, respondents were asked to select the three best ways the college could communicate with the part-time faculty. Choices were ranked as illustrated in Table 10.

Table 10

Frequency Distribution of Response to How Vista College Can Best Communicate With Part-Time Faculty (N 299)

Ways to Communicate	Absolute Frequency
Through a regular newsletter dealing with teaching and learning.	197
By offering a variety of short seminars which faculty attend based on their individual interests.	151
By meeting in discipline/program groups once each semester.	96
By selecting priority interests of faculty and offering two or three seminars during a semester to gain depth of understanding on a specific topic.	93
By providing written material through the faculty handbook and periodic supplements.	82
By providing individualized written learning materials.	25
By providing material on video tapes or audio tapes which faculty could use at their convenience.	43
Other:	
Social activities with guest speakers, or pure social gatherings for faculty to get to know one another (mentioned by 13 respondents).	21
Specific ideas for a newsletter.	8

Opinions About How Much Time Faculty Can Be Expected to Participate Voluntarily in Inservice Activities. Respondents were asked how much time, beyond the initial orientation to teaching, it was reasonable to expect faculty to participate voluntarily in inservice activities. About one-third (36.1 percent) said that one to three hours per semester was reasonable. Slightly fewer faculty (29.4 percent) said that over three hours was reasonable, and the same number (29.8 percent) said that faculty should not be expected to participate without compensation.

Additional Comments. The questionnaire closed with an open-ended question which encouraged respondents to express any additional opinions and perceptions about teaching at Vista and any further comments they thought would be helpful in further development of the college. Comments were offered by 69 percent of the respondents (137), and a sampling of additional comments is presented below:

Categories of Responses	Frequency
Suggestions for Improving Outreach Efforts	19
* Ideas for locations, class size, improvement of schedule design, publicity ideas	
Complaints About Administrative Procedures	15
* Registration, permits, duplication and audio visual services	

Categories of Responses	Frequency
About Faculty Development	14
* Positive response to prior inservice activities	
* About compensation for inservice, "As long as Vista can only offer its teachers part-time employment, it must be assumed that teachers can only give part-time interest/involvement, as the rest of their time must be devoted to earning the rest of their income."	
Evaluation and Teaching Issues	12
* More student evaluation procedures	
* A system is needed for evaluation of teacher performance	
* More conferences with planners	
* Need a clearing house for teaching resources	
Positive Comments About the Survey	
* "This questionnaire is overdue, but we are glad to see it."	
* "A good questionnaire."	
* "In my several years of part-time teaching, I've made my own mistakes and stumbled along without any real guidance from the college. This is the first time anyone has asked me what I needed in the way of help--thanks."	

Categories of Responses	Frequency
Comments About Liking Teaching and Staff Support	11
* "Keep on working at it."	
* "I found everyone willing to help. Compared to most colleges, Vista's atmosphere is most refreshing."	
* "Given the funding and staffing that Vista has to work with, the college is doing an excellent job of identifying community needs and developing courses to meet those needs. Keep up the good work."	
Specific Complaints About Payroll Procedures	8
* "All faculty should be given a clear statement in writing about how much they will be paid and when before they begin teaching."	
About the Hiring Process	7
* Improve planning and hiring process for upcoming semesters	
* Expressions of desire to continue teaching in the future	
Frustrations Over the Part-Time Role	5
* "Faculty members at Vista have extra burdens; creating and promoting classes, insecurity of never knowing if they will be teaching next semester, no financial support for non-teaching tasks, no fringe benefits."	
* "Peralta exploits teaching faculty because it makes no commitment to maintaining them, assimilating them socially or attending to their needs."	

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This research project was designed to provide information which would contribute to effective professional development activities for the part-time faculty of Vista College. The study was designed to (1) learn more about part-time faculty development in general and, in particular, about faculty development in noncampus community colleges, (2) learn about the characteristics of faculty teaching at Vista College and their inservice preferences, and (3) to provide a plan of action for future faculty development activities at Vista College. The following summary contains the salient information gathered through the study of faculty development activities at three noncampus community colleges, a study of resources related to part-time faculty development and a survey of faculty who had taught at Vista College during a three-year period.

The results of the research were shared with a study advisory committee composed of the President of the college, Dean of Instruction and six faculty members. The committee contributed ideas which were incorporated into the recommendations for future faculty development activities outlined in this chapter.

SUMMARY OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES AT THREE NONCAMPUS COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Visits were made to Pioneer Community College, Coastline Community College, and Rio Salado Community College. It was found that these colleges recognized faculty development as being very important but especially problematic in the noncampus setting, where almost all faculty were part-time.

Although all three colleges were offering faculty development activities in varying degrees, Coastline's program was the most systematic. All were providing a faculty newsletter, initial orientation to teaching and some faculty development seminars. Faculty handbooks in varying stages of sophistication were in use at all three colleges.

Administrative staff at each college were experiencing a similar pattern of faculty development problems. Three major problems were identified: (1) the physical isolation of faculty who taught in many different community locations, many of whom, in addition to teaching, worked full-time in nonacademic jobs; (2) the complex logistical problems associated with delivering appropriate activities to large numbers of faculty who taught in class sites scattered over large geographic areas; and (3) the scarcity of faculty development funding, administrative personnel and materials.

Despite all the problems associated with providing inservice activities for part-time faculty in these colleges, administrators were surprisingly enthusiastic and optimistic about continuing to improve their efforts. They were strongly committed to finding ways to make faculty development a regular component of the operation of their colleges.

SUMMARY OF MATERIALS RELATED TO PART-TIME FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

A survey of print and audio-visual resources in the faculty development area revealed that there was a wealth of material available, most of which had been designed for use by full-time faculty. Very few materials were located which had been designed specifically for part-time faculty. Most materials emphasized college policies and procedures, but a few books and pamphlets did focus on teaching methods. No materials were located which had been developed specifically for part-time faculty teaching in noncampus colleges.

Materials reviewed included periodicals, books, resource centers, and self-instructional written and videotaped units. Materials considered useful for future inservice activities at Vista College were selected and organized into a bibliography (Appendix A). The following paragraphs briefly describe the kinds of materials reviewed for different sections of the annotated bibliography.

Periodicals related exclusively to faculty development were very scarce, and none concentrated only on faculty development for part-timers. However, three excellent newsletters were found which had been designed for faculty development in community colleges and were considered appropriate for use with part-time faculty.

Several books were located which offered useful information for part-time faculty. The bibliography contains selections which address both learning theory and practical suggestions for teaching which would be appropriate for part-time instructors who have had limited training or experience in teaching.

Investigations of resources at nearby institutions revealed that the University of California at Berkeley and San Jose State University operate instructional resource centers. These centers offer consulting services to staff and faculty in neighboring community colleges.

Of particular interest was the review of self-instructional materials for part-time faculty. The use of individualized self-instructional materials seems one way to reach faculty who spend little time at a campus location and are often not available for meetings/ seminars. Many of such modules reviewed focused on college policy and procedures and few addressed teaching and learning issues. One module (Fellows, 1975) was directed toward part-time faculty who were teaching older adult students. No individualized modules were located which had been written specifically about the characteristics of teaching in a noncampus "outreach" institution. The quality of the content and format of the modules varied, with those developed recently by the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development (Media Systems Corporation, 1979) judged to be especially good.

Videotaped materials as a resource for faculty development were very scarce. Some colleges offered videotaped evaluation services to faculty; however, this process was a service and did not produce materials suitable for distribution. Two taped series were found which illustrated styles of lecturing, characteristics of young student learners, using media with nonreaders, testing and evaluation, and characteristics of the community colleges in California. The tapes were oriented toward full-time faculty teaching in campus-based colleges. While the content of these tapes had value, they were judged to have limited use for part-time faculty teaching in noncampus colleges since the instructional context was faculty working with young adult students in typical college classroom settings.

SUMMARY OF VISTA COLLEGE FACULTY SURVEY

A questionnaire (Appendix B) was sent to 408 faculty who had taught at the college during the three-year study period from Fall, 1976 to Spring, 1979. The questionnaire was returned by 299 respondents (73 percent).

Characteristics of the Faculty

It was found that over two-thirds of the faculty had advanced degrees (53 percent M.A.'s, 12 percent Ph.D.'s) and one-third had B.A.'s with appropriate work experience related to their teaching area. Most were between the ages of 30 and 50 (62 percent), and the median age was 42. There were equal numbers of men and women teaching: 75 percent were Caucasian, 11 percent were Black and seven percent Hispanic. Fluency in languages other than English was reported by 30 percent. Almost half were teaching general education courses, with the other half about equally distributed between business and human services curriculum areas.

Part-time faculty (266) composed the major cohort of the study, with only 33 (11 percent) of the 299 respondents having full-time teaching status. Of these 33, most (27) were employed full-time at other colleges in the Peralta District, and they taught at Vista as an extra service arrangement or as a part of their contract. There were only six full-timers working solely at Vista.

In relation to prior teaching experience, it was found that almost all full-time faculty had taught from three to 12 years, with only two reporting less than two-years experience. The part-timers also reported a high degree of prior experience: 89 percent had taught previously. Most faculty had taught previously in community colleges or four-year institutions. Their experiences also included teaching adults in high schools, business and industry, religious institutions, and human service agencies.

Most part-time faculty reported no formal preparation for teaching adults, and very few had studied the community college in the context of higher education. Courses in college teaching methods had been taken by 34 percent of the respondents, and 13 percent had taken a course dealing with the characteristics of the community college.

As anticipated, most part-time faculty were employed elsewhere; 40 percent worked full-time and 34 percent worked part-time, primarily in business, teaching, or human service occupations. When asked why they taught, a majority mentioned enjoyment, personal growth and opportunity to help others, and did not mention economic reasons. Money derived from teaching at Vista represented less than 10 percent of the income of 39 percent of the faculty and 25 percent or less of 63 percent of the faculty. Only eight percent said that teaching at Vista was their only source of income. When asked if they would be interested in full-time teaching, 60 percent responded positively. All others said they preferred to remain part-time.

Faculty Perceptions of Teaching at Vista

Faculty were asked about their perceptions of the college and their likes and dislikes about teaching. It was found that faculty were in strong agreement with the objectives outlined in the mission statement of the college, and that they believed the most frequent reason students enroll at Vista is for general or continuing education, rather than to complete an Associate of Arts degree.

Faculty who had had previous teaching experience in campus-based colleges were asked to give their opinions about how students in the noncampus setting were different. Respondents did not report dramatic differences, but the question elicited a high level of responses related to the motivation and goal-orientation of adult learners. Responses indicated that faculty view adult learners in the noncampus setting as being very self-directed and interested in personal and professional growth.

When asked to describe their primary method of teaching, over half the faculty said they combined lecture and discussion; about one-fourth said they combined lecture with laboratory. The remaining fourth said they combined three methods--lecture, discussion and laboratory--with experiential learning activities such as role play and socio-drama, as well as with group projects and model building.

When asked to give their opinions about their initial orientation to teaching, most respondents said they had received adequate guidance about registration and attendance reporting, and over half said that adequate guidance was given about grading procedures. Two topics were poorly rated: less than one-third said they had received adequate information about faculty payroll procedures and student counseling services.

Faculty opinions about support services indicated that over half had used the duplication services, and 70 percent of these users considered it adequate. About half had used the services of staff planners, but the remainder said they had not needed help or were unaware that help was available. Audio-visual services at Vista had been used by about half the faculty. Some faculty (24) reported that they had used equipment provided at their teaching site. Others reported that they sometimes did not use equipment because it was too much trouble to take to the site, or that equipment had not been available when requested. Of those who had not used equipment, most said it was because audio-visual presentations were not appropriate for their class. Only two faculty said they had not used equipment because they did not know how to operate it.

Use of textbooks was reported by 60 percent of the faculty, half of whom had obtained books through Vista ordering procedures; the other half had used texts supplied by local bookstores. Some faculty (45) had sent students out on their own to find books, and, in 19 cases, the agency where the class was taught either had provided books free of charge or had made arrangements to sell books at the site. Many who had not used texts (75) preferred providing handouts because textbooks were not appropriate for their classes. Others (30) said they could not obtain books in time or that textbooks were not available for the subject being taught.

A high percentage (91 percent) of the respondents said that they liked teaching at Vista. The most positive aspects of teaching were seeing students' progress and the opportunity to interact with adult students from diverse backgrounds. What faculty disliked most about teaching centered around administrative procedures (payroll problems, paperwork), problems associated with the noncampus structure (problems at sites, sense of isolation, scheduling class times), and instructional support services (having to transport AV equipment, duplication services). A few faculty (15) expressed dislikes about the actual teaching process: lack of clarification of goals for class and class content; lack of help with teaching methods and evaluation; and disappointment over students who dropped classes.

Faculty Opinions About Staff Development Activities

Faculty were asked to rank 13 inservice topics in order of priority. The five top priority topics selected were (1) student retention, (2) how adults learn, (3) how to become an effective teacher, (4) teacher evaluation, and (5) development of the instructional program. The least important topics had to do with grading, paperwork for the college, and how to write examination questions.

The majority of the faculty reported that they would be interested in participating in college advisory committees. Almost half said they would be interested in advising on instructional planning and development, 78 in planning inservice activities, 72 in evaluation of instruction, and 58 in development of a faculty senate.

Respondents were asked to give their opinions about how the college could best communicate with part-time faculty. The three most preferred ways were (1) through a regular newsletter dealing with teaching and learning, (2) by offering a series of short seminars which faculty could attend based on their individual interest, and (3) by meeting in discipline/program groups once a year.

Two-thirds of the faculty surveyed said that they thought it was reasonable to expect faculty to volunteer three hours per semester in inservice activities. The remaining faculty said that instructors should not be expected to participate in inservice activities without compensation.

CONCLUSIONS

The three components of this study summarized above lead to three conclusions: first, that there is a recognized need to provide effective inservice professional development activities for part-time faculty; second, that noncampus colleges staffed primarily by part-time have unique characteristics and problems related to provision of faculty development; and third, there is need to develop new materials appropriate for use with part-time faculty.

Faculty development programs that do exist in community colleges have been provided primarily for full-time faculty. Activities specifically designed and offered for part-timers have been limited or nonexistent, and what has been offered has often been inappropriate and considered ineffectual by those administering the activities. With recent increases in the use of part-time faculty, there is evidence that more attention must be paid to their professional development. As a higher percentage of part-timers are selected to provide instruction, it will become more obvious that they are primary resources of a college, not merely adjunct or "added-on" staff.

Noncampus colleges which employ all (or almost all) part-time faculty have organizational characteristics which present a unique opportunity to incorporate faculty development activities into the structure and governance of the college. In these colleges there is a necessity to link faculty development with the instructional program because the part-time faculty are the human resources needed to build and maintain the college. However, the characteristics of the noncampus college--large numbers of faculty teaching one or two classes in scattered geographic locations, flexible "round-the-clock" class scheduling, and high faculty turnover--contribute to difficulties in providing effective faculty development programs. These colleges present an opportunity to find creative ways to provide inservice activities for part-time faculty, and these new/adapted inservice strategies will also be useful in traditional campus-based colleges which hire large numbers of part-time faculty.

Few outstanding models for part-time faculty development were located and availability of appropriate materials for use with part-time faculty is a problem. Review of the literature shows that there is a wealth of faculty development material, most of which has been designed for full-time faculty audiences. The problem is not with a scarcity of materials, but with gathering those materials which may be useful and attractive to part-time faculty. This study provided an opportunity to locate specific existing resources considered useful for part-time faculty and to designate areas where additional materials are needed. It was found that the greatest need is for materials which address adult development and appropriate teaching/learning strategies, and for materials which address teaching in the noncampus outreach mode.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF PRACTICE

Based on an analysis of the faculty survey data, a review of the literature related to faculty development, visits to three noncampus colleges and discussion with the study advisory committee, the following broad recommendations are made. It is suggested that these recommendations form a philosophical base for planning and pilot-testing of a faculty development model for Vista College.

1. Establish faculty development as a component of the organizational structure of the college. Within the administrative structure of the college, staff should be designated who are responsible for carrying out regular faculty development activities. Faculty development should be accepted and incorporated as a necessary cost of instructional operations in the noncampus college.

2. Plan and evaluate faculty development activities with the assistance of an internal advisory group. It is important that part-time faculty and administrative heads of the instructional areas of the college give guidance to the planning, implementation and evaluation of faculty development activities. This advisory group should insure a close link between faculty needs for inservice activities and instructional goals of the institution. The advisory group should also identify internal resources for inservice activities. In this way, the college can recognize and use its own resources, calling on outside specialists only for those services which cannot be provided by existing staff.

3. Link faculty development to the goals of the college. In a noncampus college staffed by part-time faculty, inservice activities should be closely tied to the goals of the college, rather than to the professional development plans of individual faculty members. In the noncampus setting, it is important to involve part-time faculty in the pursuit of college goals and the development of instructional activities. This type of participation should reduce the sense of isolation felt by noncampus faculty and strengthen the instructional programs of the college.

4. Associate faculty development with evaluation of instruction. Through a nonpunitive evaluation process, needs for instructional improve- should be identified and then linked with appropriate faculty development activities. Techniques such as student evaluation of instruction, faculty self-evaluation and observations by instructional staff should be used to identify needs for instructional improvement. Inservice activities should then focus on the specific needs of individual faculty and groups of faculty.

5. Provide trained college personnel for technical assistance to part-time faculty. In the noncampus college some part-time faculty are new to teaching or may be new to diverse adult student audiences. Teaching and learning assistance should be provided to faculty through the use of peer teaching/learning consultants. These consultants, trained in counseling and teaching techniques, can be on call to establish a helping relationship with faculty; to observe teaching, assist in analysis of course content and provide advice about teaching strategies and adult learners. It is important that these consultants be viewed as resource specialists by the faculty and not viewed as supervisory evaluators who are tied to future hiring. The two functions of technical consultation and administrative evaluation should be kept separate to insure a sense of trust between faculty and the peer teaching/learning consultants.

6. Develop a communication system which provides a dialog about teaching and learning. A system is needed which provides a means for communication between and among faculty and administrators. The system should stimulate an open dialog about teaching and learning with continuous feedback mechanisms to encourage isolated faculty to communicate with each other about the issues and challenges related to teaching adult students in the noncampus setting.

STRATEGIES FOR DIFFUSION, IMPLEMENTATION AND CHANGE

Considering the broad recommendations previously discussed as a philosophical base, it is proposed that Vista College test and evaluate a cohesive sequence of faculty development activities in the next three years. It is anticipated that after this time period, a faculty development model unique to the characteristics of this college could be institutionalized as an established component of the instructional program. While it is anticipated that the college can support a portion of the costs associated with developing such a system, it is realistic to assume that additional funding from outside sources may be necessary for the initiation of these activities. It is expected that once the system is established, however, adequate college resources will be available to continue the faculty development activities.

The following suggestions are made for strategies and implementation of an experimental, internal faculty development model for Vista College. Central to the success of these implementation strategies is the assignment of a full-time administrator who would assume responsibility for the planning and operation of faculty development activities at the college.

1. Establishment of an internal advisory committee. This committee should assist in planning, coordinating and evaluating faculty development activities. It should be an administrative/faculty advisory group composed of the Dean of Instruction, four part-time faculty representatives and one full-time staff representative from each of four major instructional areas of the college (Energy and Environmental Management, General Education, Business and Human Services). This committee should meet regularly to give direction to faculty inservice activities.

2. Improvement of orientation strategies. Orientation for new faculty should be improved through the use of videotaped materials to

supplement and improve group orientation sessions. The materials should focus on the unique features of teaching in the noncampus setting and be available as new faculty are hired throughout the year. In addition, the faculty handbook should be expanded to include information about characteristics of adult learners and recommended teaching strategies related to teaching adults in the noncampus setting.

3. Provision of faculty development materials. Materials found to be useful for part-time faculty (selected from Appendix A) should be purchased and made available in the college's professional library. A resource room adjacent to the library should be established as a space for faculty to review materials and meet together with the project director to discuss aspects of the materials and related topics about teaching. New materials may have to be developed about the adult learner and individualization of instruction related to the diverse needs of adults as well as materials related to teaching in the noncampus setting--the two areas where existing resources were found to be weak.

4. Selection and training of teaching/learning consultants. During the first year, four or five part-time faculty should be selected and trained to be supportive and competent peer advisors in a broad range of teaching and learning areas. In the second year, others should be added to reach a goal of 10 or 12 experienced teaching/learning consultants (TLC's). The role of the TLC's would be to provide technical assistance to faculty. The TLC role resembles peer mentoring, which occurs often in an informal way among full-time faculty in campus-based colleges, but part-time faculty in noncampus colleges are rarely involved in such activities. The following paragraphs describe the TLC role and

the mechanics of how they would work with part-time faculty colleagues.

The TLC's should be selected from part-timers who are recognized as good teachers by the instructional staff. They should be faculty who express interest and commitment to learning more about teaching, who have good interpersonal and administrative skills, who represent different personality types and subject areas, and who are likely to remain in the area for a few years. The project director and TLC's should engage in a training period of one semester after which time the TLC's should be on call for consultation with instructors in the field. The TLC's should be hired through a special consultant contract, probably for about 50 hours per semester.

The TLC's should be resource consultants whose services should be publicized through orientation, workshop sessions, newsletter articles, and personal contact with the part-time faculty. In the initial phase, faculty would be asked to invite the new TLC's to their classes to introduce them to the different instructional programs of the college. This activity should orient TLC's to the strengths and weaknesses of existing instructional practices throughout the college. In the next phase, faculty should be encouraged to invite TLC's to provide observation and problem solving consultation around specific teaching/learning issues they encounter. In addition, needs for instructional improvement and follow-up consultations by TLC's would happen through analysis of faculty self-evaluation processes. Faculty should be asked to designate teaching/learning areas they would like to improve. TLC's would sort through these instructor self-evaluation data and identify similar problems and goals. TLC's would then follow up with appropriate individual or group consultation activities.

5. Workshops and seminars. Workshops and seminars would be provided to both address specific instructional topics and build a sense of community among the faculty. Topics for these activities would be selected from priority needs expressed through communication channels of evaluation processes, newsletter feedback and observations of TLC's in the field. It is recommended that one college-wide workshop on a substantive learning/teaching area be provided each year with mini-seminars throughout the year on specific, narrower topics.

6. Development of a communication system. The existing college newsletter should be adapted so that it is published more frequently and focuses on teaching and learning issues to become an ongoing, interactive communication link among faculty and instructional administrators. Faculty should be encouraged to contribute brief descriptions of "what works" for them in their classrooms and descriptions of their instructional strategies. A section which featured a dialog between faculty about teaching/learning issues should be included. The newsletter should also include a regular section for feedback from faculty about inservice and evaluation activities and what they would like to see included in future issues. The newsletter should be a link between TLC's and the faculty and should include information about college support services and new resource materials in the professional library.

7. Evaluation. An evaluation process should be designed that enables faculty to indicate their inservice goals and preferences. Administrative evaluations/observations should be carried out independently of the faculty self-evaluations, which should be used to plan faculty development activities. However, the faculty development

director who would be outside the hiring process, should study both sets of data to make decisions about activities needed to improve the college instructional program.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Astin, Alexander A., et al. "Faculty Development: In a Time of Retrenchment." Change. Group for Human Development in Education. New York: 1974.

Babbie, Earl R. Survey Research Methods. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1973.

Bender, L. W. and J. O. Hammonds. "Adjunct Faculty: Forgotten and Neglected." Community and Junior College Journal, October, 1972.

________, and R. L. Breuder. "Part-Time Teachers--'Step Children' of the Community College." Community College Review, April, 1973.

Boulding, Kenneth E. "The Management of Decline." AGE REPORTS, Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. Sept./Oct., 1975.

Case, Chester H. Professional Staff Development: A Community College Model. Pittsburg, California: Community College Press, 1976.

Cato, Jimmy E. Staff Development: A Study of Perceptions of Faculty and Administrators at Three Urban Community Colleges Within the Peralta Community College District. (Unpublished Major Applied Research Project). Fort Lauderdale: Nova University, 1978.

Centra, John A. Strategies for Improving College Teaching. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education for ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. December, 1972.

________. Faculty Development Practices in U.S. Colleges and Universities. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, November, 1976.

Davis, Carol A. Staff Development: A Model Program for Oakton Community College. (Unpublished Major Research Project). Fort Lauderdale: Nova University, 1976.

Ernst, Richard J., and Larry A. McFarlane. "Are We Shortchanging Our Students by Using Part-Time Faculty?" In Employing Part-Time Faculty, ed. David W. Leslie. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1978.

Fryer, Thomas W., Jr. "New Policies for the Part-Time Faculty." In Leadership for Higher Education, ed. Roger W. Heyns. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1977.

Gaff, Jerry G. *Toward Faculty Renewal*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975.

Gleazer, E. J. *Directory of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1977.

Haddad, Margaret and Mary Ellen Dickens. "Competencies for Part-Time Faculty--The First Step." *Community and Junior College Journal*, November, 1978.

Hammons, James O., Terry H. Smith Wallace and Gordon Watts. *Staff Development in the Community College: A Handbook*. Topical Paper No. 66. Los Angeles: University of California, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1978.

Head, Ronald B. *Legal Issues Concerning Part-Time Faculty Employment*. (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation). University of Virginia, 1978.

Heinberg, S. *Procedures for the Supervision and Evaluation of New Part-Time Evening Division Instructors in California Junior Colleges*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). University of Southern California, 1966.

Hoenninger, Ronald and Richard A. Black. "Neglect of a Species." *Community and Junior College Journal*, November, 1978.

Koltai, Leslie. *The Part-Time Faculty and the Community College*. Los Angeles Community College District, ERIC Document ED 118 174, 1976.

Leslie, David W. "Current Perspectives on Part-Time Faculty." *AAHE Bulletin*. American Association of Higher Education, ERIC Research Report, November, 1978.

Lombardi, John. *Part-Time Faculty in Community Colleges*. Topical Paper No. 54. Los Angeles: University of California, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, December, 1975.

________. *Noncampus Colleges: New Governance Patterns for Outreach Programs*. Topical Paper No. 60. Los Angeles: University of California, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, March, 1977.

Medsker, Leland L. and Dale Tillery. *Breaking the Access Barriers: A Profile of Two-Year Colleges*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1971.

Mertes, D. H. *Part-Time Faculty: Who, Why, When, Where?* Presentation given at the Annual Conference of the California Community Junior College Association, San Diego, November, 1975.

Novak, Charles R. and Barbara K. Barnes. "Florida and Illinois: Views on Staff Development." In Developing Staff Potential. New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 19, ed. Terry O'Banion. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Autumn, 1977.

O'Banion, Terry. Teachers for Tomorrow: Staff Development in the Community Junior College. Arizona: The University of Arizona Press, 1972.

________. "Staff Development: A New Priority for the Seventies." The College Board Review, No. 99. College Entrance Examination Board, Spring, 1976.

________. Developing Staff Potential. New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 19. Jossey-Bass, Inc., Autumn, 1977.

________. Organizing Staff Development Programs That Work. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1978.

Oppenheim, A. M. Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement. New York: Basic Books, 1966.

Payne, S. L. The Art of Asking Questions. New Jersey: Princeton University, 1951.

Peterson, Vance. "Part-Time Teachers: An Analysis of Adjunct Faculty Staffing and Compensation in the Peralta Community Colleges." California: Office of Educational Services, Peralta Community College District, Oakland, 1974. (Mimeographed).

Raines, Max R. "Faculty Development Inventory." In Cato, Jimmy E., Staff Development: A Study of Perceptions of Faculty and Administrators at Three Urban Community Colleges Within the Peralta Community College District. (Unpublished Major Applied Research Project). Fort Lauderdale: Nova University, 1978.

Ross, D. M. Preliminary Report on Part-Time Faculty. Sacramento, California: California Community College Trustees, California School Board Association, May, 1975.

Schultz, Raymond E. and William J. Roed. Report on Inservice Needs of Community College Part-Time Occupational Instructors. Arizona: Office of Research in Higher Education, College of Education, University of Arizona, May, 1978.

Scigliano, John A. "Faculty Development: Issues and Directions." Peabody Journal of Education, January, 1978.

Scully, M. G. "Part-Time Teachers: Many Are Angry." The Chronicle of Higher Education. January 20, 1975.

Selltiz, Claire, Marie Jahorda, Martin Deutch and Stuart Cook, eds. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt and Company, 1959.

Smith, Al. Staff Development Practices in U.S. Community Colleges. Lexington, Kentucky: Publications Commission AACJC Council for Staff, Program and Organizational Development, January, 1980.

Staff Development Resource Inventory and Directory. Los Angeles: League for Innovation in the Community Colleges, 1977.

Weinrich, J. William and J. David Eakin. "Faculty Orientation in Community Colleges." Community College Review. Fall, 1978.

Williams, F. N. "The Neglected Teachers: The Part-Time Faculty." Adult Leadership, September, 1972.

Zion, Carol and Connie Sutton. "Integrated Inservice Development." In New Directions for Community Colleges, ed. A. M. Cohen, No. 1, Spring, 1973.

APPENDIXES

MATERIALS AND RESOURCES OF VALUE FOR PLANNING FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES AT VISTA COLLEGE

A Selected, Annotated Bibliography

CONTENT AND ORGANIZATION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT AT OTHER COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Los Angeles Community Colleges. New Dimensions "Contemporary Seminars". 1977.

A booklet presenting a plan for staff development for faculty, administrators and classified staff in the Los Angeles Community College District. Outlines 17 seminars designated to be of interest to faculty. A helpful resource for designing seminar content and includes several topics specifically directed to part-time faculty.

Los Medanos College, Pittsburg, California. Professional Staff Development: A Community College Model by Chester Case. Community College Press, 1976.

A report of a professional development program developed for a new college. Contains segments relevant to inservice training for new faculty and outlines seminars which are useful to others planning faculty development activities.

Maricopa Community College District, Phoenix, Arizona. Schedule of Occupational Part-Time Instructor Inservice Education Sessions for Fall Semester of 1975-1976. ED 116 732.

An annotated list of 13 learning units (seminars) including a course on the community college. While designed for part-time instructors this program was also attended by full-time instructors. Outlines of units are useful for planning similar activities for part-time vocational as well as general education instructors.

Seattle Community College District Staff Development Program. Seattle, Washington. "Staff Development Communicator", 1977-1978.

A pamphlet giving a schedule of activities planned for an academic year for staff, faculty and administrators as well as a brief evaluation of the previous years' activities. Good overview of how a college district plans for an entire year. Outlines some seminars appropriate for use with part-time faculty in a noncampus community college.

Seminole Community Colleges, Stanford, Florida. Development of a Curriculum for a Community College Teaching Workshop for Adjunct Faculty by William F. Elwood, 1976. ED 129 395.

Describes a 15-hour workshop for new adjunct faculty. While developed specifically for this college, workshop content on Role of the Instructor, the Teaching Learning Interface, Teaching Strategies, Instructional Aids and Instructional Evaluation is relevant to all community colleges.

PERIODICALS RELATED TO FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Faculty Development and Evaluation Newspaper, Dr. Albert B. Smith, Editor, 3930 N.W. 35th Place, Gainsville, Florida, 32605.

A quarterly newspaper devoted to faculty development issues. Contains articles relative to community college teaching as well as to four year colleges and universities. A worthwhile publication for keeping up to date on national faculty development activities, research reports on faculty development and specific articles about the improvement of teaching.

Linkages. National Institute for Staff Development/Kellog Foundation Project. National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development, EDB, University of Texas, Austin, Texas, 78712.

A bi-monthly publication concerned with trends in staff development in community colleges. A good resource to keep abreast of national activities related to faculty development.

Abstracts. National Institute for Staff Development (see address above). One page abstracts of articles and books useful for distribution to faculty and staff. Excellent short overviews of topics with references for further reading. Abstracts are provided to institutions who subscribe to this consortium. Early titles in the series have included: A Futuristic Look: Education in 1985, Four Critical Minutes, Creative Use of Silence in the Classroom.

PUBLICATIONS RELATED TO TEACHING AND LEARNING

Bergguist, W. and Phillips, S. A Handbook for Faculty Development. Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1975.

Deals with the teaching-learning process focusing on ways to achieve new structures and interactions in the classroom. Discuss topics such as active and passive learning styles and questioning skills for instructors.

Bernstein, Harvey R. *Manual for Teaching Assistants*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education, 1975.

Although written primarily for graduate and undergraduate teaching assistants, this manual is especially beneficial for any who have limited, or no teaching experience. Useful for new community college faculty, as it contains practical suggestions (rather than theoretical discourses) for a wide range of educational problems.

Centra, John A. "Colleagues as Raters of Classroom Instruction". *Journal of Higher Education*. May/June 1975, pp. 327-338.

Probes several aspects of teaching that colleagues are able to evaluate. Other methods of assessing teaching are also discussed.

Centra, John A. *Strategies for Improving College Teaching*. Washington D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, December 1972.

Contains two articles which could be used with part-time faculty to stimulate thinking about improving teaching practices: (1) "A Teaching and Learning Model" and (2) "Self Analysis and Teaching Improvement".

Cross, K. Patricia. *Accent on Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Presents strong research grounded suggestions for improvement of instruction. Sections on Individualizing Instruction, Mastery Learning and Self-Paced Modules, Cognitive Styles, Experiential Learning and Interpersonal Skills are valuable for developing inservice activities for part-time faculty.

Garrison, Roger H., ed. "Implementing Innovative Instruction", *New Directions* for Community Colleges.

Illustrates effective instructional methods in community colleges. Topics include: how to teach better, how to enhance a student's learning, how to make instruction more efficient, and how to motivate students and engage them more fully in their own development. Approaches and teaching methods in community colleges are described.

Gilstrap, R. and Martin, W. *Current Strategies for Teachers*. Goodyear Publishing Co., 1975.

Provides descriptions of teaching methods including objectives for use of a method, advantages and recommended use and disadvantages of method. Includes traditional methods of lecture and discussion as well as use of role playing, discovery learning, buzz groups, simulations and peer teaching.

Knox, Alan B. *Adult Development and Learning*. A Handbook on Individual Growth and Competence in the Adult Years for Education and the Helping Professions. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1977.

Presents a comprehensive developmental perspective on adulthood with a component on adult learning which includes suggestions for appropriate teaching strategies.

Mager, Robert F. *Developing Attitude Toward Learning*. Belmont: Fearon-Pittman Publishers, Inc., 1968.

Shows teachers how to recognize student behaviors that give evidence of positive or negative attitudes about instruction. Describes principles teachers can apply to help students develop facorable attitudes toward learning. Written with clarity and interesting style.

Mager, Robert F. and Beach Jr., Kenneth M. *Developing Vocational Instruction*. Belmont: Fearon-Pittman Publishers, Inc.

Explains in understandable language the systematic development of instruction and how skills and knowledge can be transmitted. Practical examples are given in this valuable guide for instructors teaching in vocational and academic subjects.

Mager, Robert F. *Goal Analysis*. Belmont: Fearon-Pittman Publishers, Inc. Describes a goal analysis procedure to help instructors describe the meaning of goals they hope to achieve. Helps instructors design meaningful and achievable goals for students.

Mager, Robert F. *Measuring Instructional Intent*. Belmont: Fearon-Pittman Publishers, Inc., 1973.

Shows how to select and create test items that match the intent of objectives. Explains ways to measure the success of instruction. Offers many examples to illustrate principles.

Mager, Robert F. *Preparing Instructional Objectives*. Belmont: Fearon-Pittman Publishers, 1975.

A very clear resource for assisting instructors in preparation of instructional objectives. Identifies ways to recognize characteristics of well-stated objectives. Excellent practice materials are provided.

McKeachie, Wilbert J. *Teaching Tips: A Guidebook for the Beginning College Teacher*. Lexington: D.C. Heath, 1951.

Offers numerous effective teaching methods and advice on how to evaluate productiveness of methods. A practical guidebook for beginning college teachers. Has an approach relevant to campus based teaching, but basic principles are relevant to all teaching.

Miller, W. R. and Rose, H. C. Instructors and Their Jobs. American Technical Society, 1975.

Comprehensive practical guide for instructors including overview of teaching methods, teacher-student communication and use of common types of media to supplement classroom instruction.

Verduin, John R. Jr., Miller, Harry G. and Greer, Charles E. Adults Teaching Adults: Principles and Strategies. Austin, Texas: Learning Concepts, 1977.

An introductory textbook designed to assist those who are teaching adults. Presents an overview of adult behavior and learning, recommends appropriate instructional processes and practical suggestions for teaching specific material. A good resource book to give teachers ideas about how to use various teaching techniques when working with adult learners.

RESOURCES AT OTHER NEARBY INSTITUTIONS

Instructional Resource Center, San Jose State University, San Jose, Calif.
Ron J. Beath, Director
Jerrod E. Kemp, Coordinator

This Center has developed written self-instructional learning modules available for purchase and offers consultation to visiting colleges.

Teaching Innovation and Evaluation Services (TIES)
262 Stevens Hall, University of California, Berkeley
Robert C. Wilson, Director

The goal of the TIES office is to assist individual faculty members, teaching assistants, programs and departments in their efforts to innovate, evaluate and improve instruction on the Berkeley campus. Services include: literature and information on university teaching and learning, design of instructional innovation and evaluation, consultation, and assistance in developing procedures and instruments for assessing teaching effectiveness. Publishes newsletters and handbooks on teaching and evaluation which are available to community colleges. Consultation is also available.

SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL WRITTEN LEARNING MODULES

Dallas Community College District.

Five independent study units developed for part-time staff development programs: (1) Teaching and Learning Strategies, (2) Developmental Learning Skills, (3) Testing Grading and Evaluation, (4) Student Characteristics and Student Services, and (5) DCCCD Mission, Philosophy and Related Policies. Units are designed with focus on new part-time instructors. Units 1, 2 and 3 are useful as written at other community colleges. The other two, (4) and (5) require revisions to make content specific to another college or college district

Instructional Resource Center, San Jose State University.

Modules developed primarily for full-time faculty are adaptable for use with part-time community college faculty. Self-Appraisal Form, Setting Objectives, Preparing Lectures, Conducting Discussions, Constructing Multiple Choice Items, Constructing True/False Test Items, Constructing Matching Test Items.

Fellows, David B. An Introduction to Continuing Education. "A Self Instructional Orientation for Part-Time Faculty", in: An Evaluation Plan for Part-Time Faculty in Community/Junior Colleges. Major Applied Research Project, Nova University, 1975.

This self-instructional module was developed as a part of an evaluation process for part-time faculty in continuing education division at St. Petersburg Florida Jr. College. The module was designed to acquaint faculty with contemporary concepts related to adult education and adult learners, factors surrounding the adult learning situation and suggestions for appropriate teaching strategies. Evaluation of this module showed positive responses by faculty, especially those new to teaching. With revisions to eliminate references to a specific college, this module could be most useful to part-time faculty in other similar teaching roles.

League for Innovation in the Community College.

Orientation to Instruction in the Community College. A Series of Ten Short Self-Instructional Units., 1979.

The units were developed and refined under a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education. The units, developed by staff from Maricopa Community College District and Richland College, were to be field tested at Coastline Community College in the Fall of 1979. Projected date for available use by other colleges is Spring 1980. The units are developed for part-time faculty and other instructors new to the community college. Topics include: Community College Philosophy and Characteristics, Student Characteristics, Student Personnel Services, Planning Instructional Outcomes, Causing Learning, Group Methods of Instruction, Individualized Instruction, Using Media to Improve Instruction, Test Construction, and Grading and Evaluation.

Media Systems Corporation. A subsidiary of Harcourt Brace Janovitch, Inc.
757 Third Avenue, N.Y., 10017, 1979.

Nine modules developed by the National Institute for Staff Development, John E. Rouche, Coordinator. Each module is in booklet form, is self-instructional with feedback mechanisms. Booklets are well designed, format is very readable and illustrations are good. It is expected that faculty will respond favorably to these modules.

Modules:

Student Behavior and Attitude: The Affective Domain by Patricia F. Archer.

Assessing Student Opinions of the Learning Experience: An Instrument Packet by John E. Rouche, Barbara P. Mink and Oscar G. Mink.

Questioning as a Teaching Tool by Carolyn Thompson.

Toward Learner-Centered Instruction: Risking Change for Professional Growth by Karen Watkins.

From Hear to Internality: A Function of Learning Groups in the Community College Classroom by Oscar G. Mink.

Writing Behavioral Objectives in the Affective Domain by Patricia F. Archer.

Writing Higher-Level Learning Objectives: The Cognitive Domain by Patricia F. Archer.

Improving Student Motivation by John Rouche and Oscar G. Mink.

Confronting Student Attitudes by John E. Rouche, Barbara P. Mink and Oscar G. Mink.

Mt. San Jacinto College. Media Center, 21400 Highway 79, San Jacinto, Calif.

Individualized instruction modules which include a written module with an audio cassette and film strip to illustrate concepts. Titles include: Preparing and Using Instructional Sheets, Designing and Using Overhead Transparantus, Preparing and Using Slide Tape Presentations, How Do You Know You Need Instructional Aid?, Preparing and Using Video Tapes.

Video Tape Faculty Development Materials

Instructional Resource Center, San Jose State University. Video tape on lecturing. Tape presents three different styles of lecturing and how faculty may use video to critique and improve teaching.

DeAnza Community College, Cupertino, California. A ten-part video print prepared under the direction of David Kest, Dean of Humanities. Series covers ten topics which have been consolidated into one presentation. Preview of this tape indicated that some segments of the tape might be useful to stimulate discussion among part-time faculty who teach in non-campus colleges. However, the total presentation is oriented to a campus-based traditional college. The segments demonstrating different teaching styles are most valuable. Topics in the series include: What Makes Teachers Good, Good Teachers Share Ideas, How and Where We Learn, Working With Individuals, Working With Non-Readers Through Media, Testing and Evaluation, The History and Characteristics of the Community College.

APPENDIX B

VISTA COLLEGE

MAY 1979

FACULTY SURVEY FACULTY SURVEY FACULTY SURVEY

SURVEY FACULTY SURVEY

(1-3)

4/1

Vista College
2020 Milvia Street
Berkeley, Ca. 19704
May, 1979

Dear Faculty Member:

The growth of Vista College (formerly Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study) has been extensive. During the 1977 Spring Semester, fifty-two faculty taught 935 students. Since that time, over 400 faculty have taught at the college and 9,000 students enrolled this Spring.

You are one of the 400 faculty who have taught at Vista sometime during the past two years. In order to continually improve the operations of the college, we are conducting a faculty survey. The purpose of the survey is to create an up-to-date director of faculty who wish to continue teaching and to gather faculty perceptions and opinions about the college. This information will help us improve curriculum planning, administrative procedures, inservice activities and general services to the faculty.

Please assist us by taking about thirty minutes to answer this questionnaire. The first page contains specific information needed to up-date our files. The remaining questions will help us know the characteristics of the faculty as a whole and their perceptions and opinions about the college. I assure you that your answers will be kept confidential and will not influence future hiring practices. Results of the survey will be shared faculty who complete the questionnaire. Thank you in advance for your help.

Sincerely,

(signature here in original)

John J. Holleman
President

INSTRUCTIONS

Do you wish to continue to be an active member of the faculty associated with Vista College? This means that you wish to have your name kept in the active files and may be called on in the future to consider teaching assignments as instructional needs arise. (Please check ( ) the appropriate box below).

^{1}( ) Yes

If yes, proceed to next page, complete the questionnaire and mail back in the enclosed stamped envelope as soon as possible. (Please return no later than May 22.

^{0}( ) No

If no, please sign your name below and mail back the unanswered questionnaire in the enclosed stamped envelope. We will remove your name from our active files.

____

I do not wish to remain an active faculty associate at Vista College.

Please fill in the following information:

1. Name ______________________ Telephone ________ home ________ work

2. Address ______________ street ______________ city ______________ zip code

3. Educational Background. *Please* ☑ *check all degrees you have earned and indicate major.*

☐ B.A., B.S. ________ major ________ minor 6/

☐ M.A., M.S. ________ major ________ minor 7/

☐ Ph.D., Ed.D. ________________ subject 8/

4. What are the subject areas that your community college credential allows you to teach?

________________ ________________

________________ ________________

5. What courses have you taught at Vista? 9/

________________ ________________

________________ ________________

________________ ________________

________________ ________________

6. Which semesters have you taught at Vista? *Please check all semesters you taught.*

☐ Fall, 1976 10/

☐ Spring, 1977 11/

☐ Fall, 1977 12/

☐ Spring, 1978 13/

☐ Fall, 1978 14/

☐ Spring, 1979 15/

7. For future planning, we need to know what you consider to be your teaching specialities.

A. Within the subjects your credential qualifies you to teach, which two do you most like to teach?

________________ ________________

B. If you had to choose two other subjects your credential qualifies you to teach, which would be your next two preferences?

________________ ________________ 16/5

(1)

8. What is your teaching status in the Peralta District?

^{1}☐ Full-time↓ ^{2}☐ Part-time (*Please skip to question 10 below*). 17/

9. If full-time, where do you teach? 18/

^{1}☐ Teach at Vista only.

^{2}☐ Vista and another campus. (*Please check each campus where you teach*).

☐ Alameda 19/

☐ Laney 20/

☐ Merritt 21/

A. How many years have you taught at the college level? 22/

^{1}☐ 1 to 2 years

^{2}☐ 3 to 6 years

^{3}☐ 7 to 12 years

^{4}☐ more than 12 years

(*Please skip to question 11, on page 4*).

10. If part-time:

A. Did you have any teaching experience before you first came to Vista?

^{1}☐ Yes - *Please use chart below to show how many years you have taught part- or full-time at each type of institution.* ↓ ^{2}☐ No - *Please skip to next page.* 23/

Kind of Institution or Program	Number of Years Full-time Teaching	Number of Years Part-time Teaching	
Community or Junior College	__yrs. ☐ None	__yrs. ☐ None	24-27/
Four-year college or University	__yrs. ☐ None	__yrs. ☐ None	28-31/
High School	__yrs. ☐ None	__yrs. ☐ None	32-35/
Other (*Please describe*)			
________________	__yrs. ☐ None	__yrs. ☐ None	36-39/
________________	__yrs. ☐ None	__yrs. ☐ None	40-43/

(1) 44/b

B. Have you ever enrolled in a State College or University course in:

1. College teaching methods? 45/

^{1}☐ Yes
^{0}☐ No

2. The characteristics/nature of the community college? 46/

^{1}☐ Yes
^{0}☐ No

C. Do you hold any paid positions in addition to teaching in the Peralta Community Colleges? 47/

^{1}☐ Yes ^{0}☐ No

↓

If yes: Please describe the other work you do.

☐ I work full-time as a ______________________ 48-49/

☐ I work part-time as a ______________________ 50-51/

D. There are many different reasons why a person may teach in a community college. *For each reason listed below, please check* *one* *answer to show how much that factor has to do with why you teach.*

	A most important reason I teach 3	An important reason, but not the most important reason I teach 2	A reason, but not an important one for teaching 1	Not a reason I teach 0	
Because I enjoy teaching	☐	☐	☐	☐	52/
Because teaching is a high status occupation	☐	☐	☐	☐	53/
Because I really need the money to live on	☐	☐	☐	☐	54/
Because I like having the extra income	☐	☐	☐	☐	55/
Because of the personal/intellectual growth I gain through teaching process	☐	☐	☐	☐	56/
Because I like helping others	☐	☐	☐	☐	57/

(1) 58/B

E. During a semester when you are teaching part-time, about how much of your total income is derived from teaching? 59/

^{1}☐ less than 10%
^{2}☐ 10% - 24%
^{3}☐ 25% - 49%
^{4}☐ 50% - 74%
^{5}☐ 75% - 99%
^{6}☐ 100%

F. If the time ever came when full-time teaching were available, which would you prefer? 60/

^{1}☐ to remain a part-time instructor
^{2}☐ to become a full-time instructor

11. How old are you? 61/

^{1}☐ less than 25 years old
^{2}☐ 25-29
^{3}☐ 30-39
^{4}☐ 40-49
^{5}☐ 50-59
^{6}☐ 60-69
^{7}☐ 70 or older

12. What is your ethnic background? 62/

^{1}☐ Chinese, Japanese or other Asian American
^{2}☐ Black, Afro-American
^{3}☐ Caucasian
^{4}☐ American Indian (Native American)
^{5}☐ Other *(please describe)* ____________________

A. Are you of Spanish, Mexican or Latin American Descent? 63/

^{1}☐ Yes
^{0}☐ No

13. Are you fluent in languages other than English? 64/

^{1}☐ Yes ↓ *If yes, please check which language(s)*

^{0}☐ No *If no, please skip to Question 14*

☐ Spanish 65/
☐ French 66/
☐ Chinese 67/
☐ Japanese 68/
☐ Tagalog 69/
☐ German 70/
☐ Other *(please specify)* ____________________ 71/

(1) 72-80/B

112(1-3)

4/2

14. What sex are you?

5/

1☐ Female
2☐ Male

15. The following statement from the recent accreditation report presents the broad goal of Vista College.

Mission Statement

> "Vista College is a noncampus community college with a dual mission to: (1) provide service to adults of all ages and backgrounds who are interested in postsecondary education through the development and delivery of lifelong learning options; (2) provide service to the community through partnership with public agencies and private organizations."

The same document lists the following specific objectives for the college. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each as an appropriate objective for the college? *Please check one answer for each.*

	Agree Strongly 5	Agree Somewhat 4	No Opinion 3	Disagree Somewhat 2	Strongly Disagree 1	
To offer education in four broad areas: Business, Alternative Technology and Environmental Management, Human Services and General Studies.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	6/
To offer learning experiences at different times and places using a variety of teaching methods.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	7/
To provide counseling and assistance to adults in group and individual settings.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	8/
To involve the community in assessing educational needs and identifying new students.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	9/
To focus college resources on community problems.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	1

16. From your experience, why do you think students have enrolled in the classes you have taught at Vista? *Please choose the two main reasons students have enrolled in your classes.* 11-12/

1. _____ To complete AA degree requirements or to take courses to transfer to State College or University.
2. _____ To improve present job skills (inservice).
3. _____ For general interest (continuing education).
4. _____ Job seeking, looking for new work, or to change work.
5. _____ Other (*please specify*) ______________________________

17. Have you taught at a community college other than Vista? 13/

^{1}☐ Yes ^{0}☐ No (*Please skip to Question 18*)

Almost everyone agrees that students who attend Vista College community based classes are older than the usual 18-20 year old community college student. But not everyone agrees about other differences between students who attend community based classes and those who attend classes on a community college campus. *For each statement below, please check one answer to indicate whether you agree or disagree.*

	Agree Strongly 5	Agree Somewhat 4	Neither Agree nor Disagree 3	Disagree Somewhat 2	Disagree Strongly 1	
Most students in outreach classes work harder at learning.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	14/
Most students in community based classes have better reading skills, are more verbal and generally better educated.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	15/
Most students on a college campus raise more questions and think more critically.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	16/
Most students in community based classes are more critical of instructors' teaching methods.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	17/

Please describe below any other ways in which you find the students in community based classes different from the students who enroll on a college campus.

____

____ 18-19/

20-21/

18. What are your primary teaching methods? *Choose the one statement below that best describes the way you teach* *__most of the time.__*

☐ Lecture, little or no discussion 22/
☐ Lecture and discussion combined 23/
☐ Discussion mainly 24/
☐ Lecture and laboratory 25/
☐ Individualized learning laboratory 26/
☐ Independent study 27/
☐ Television, instructor role as seminar/discussion leader 28/
☐ Other (*please specify*) ____________________ 29/

19. Below is a list of various procedures instructors at Vista need to learn. For each one, *please check one answer to show whether you think Vista gave you enough orientation in that area.* 30/b

	Yes 1	No 0	
A. Were you given enough guidance about registration procedures?	☐	☐	31/
B. Were you given enough guidance about procedures for attendance reporting?	☐	☐	32/
C. Were you given enough guidance about procedures for grading students?	☐	☐	33/
D. Were you given enough information about payroll procedures?	☐	☐	34/
E. Were you given enough information about counseling services available to students?	☐	☐	35/

36/b

20. How satisfied have you been with the service for duplication of materials? 37/

^{5}☐ Service is more than adequate
^{4}☐ Service is adequate
^{3}☐ Service is not adequate
^{2}☐ Can't say, haven't used
^{1}☐ Didn't know there was such a service

21. How satisfied have you been with help about classroom matters of teaching from staff planners? 38/

^{5}☐ Planners have been very helpful
^{4}☐ Planners have been somewhat helpful
^{3}☐ Planners have not been helpful
^{2}☐ I have not needed help from planners
^{1}☐ I did not know planners were available

22. During your teaching at Vista, have you used any audio visual equipment such as films, slides, overhead projectors or recorders? 39/

^{1}☐ Yes *(Continue with Question 23)* ^{0}☐ No *(Please skip to Question 24)*

23. FOR THOSE WHO HAVE USED AUDIO VISUAL EQUIPMENT AT VISTA:

A. Which equipment have you used at Vista? *(Check all that apply)*

- ☐ 16 mm film projector 40/
- ☐ 35 mm slide projector 41/
- ☐ Overhead projector 42/
- ☐ Video recorder 43/
- ☐ Audio recorder 44/

B. Was there ever a time when you needed or wanted to use the equipment at Vista and didn't? 45/ƀ

^{1}☐ Yes *(Please answer Part C)* ^{0}☐ No *(Please skip to Question 25)* 46/

C. What kept you from using it at those times? *(Check all that apply)*

- ☐ Couldn't get films or tapes 47/
- ☐ Equipment (projector, recorder, etc.) wasn't available when I requested it 48/
- ☐ It was too much trouble to take equipment to community site 49/
- ☐ Other reason *(Please describe:* ______________________ 50/

____

51/ƀ

(Now skip to Question 25)

24. FOR THOSE WHO HAVE NOT USED AUDIO VISUAL EQUIPMENT AT VISTA:

What were your reasons for not using such equipment? *(Check all that apply)*

- ☐ Not appropriate for use in my particular class(es) 52/
- ☐ Did not know equipment was available 53/
- ☐ Never thought about using audio visual equipment 54/
- ☐ It was too much trouble to take equipment to community site 55/
- ☐ Couldn't get films or tapes I needed 56/
- ☐ Equipment (projector, recorder, etc.) wasn't available when I requested it 57/
- ☐ Other reason *(Please describe:* ______________________ 58/

____

(2) 59/ƀ

25. Have you used textbooks when teaching at Vista? 60/

^{1}☐ Yes ^{2}☐ No (*Please skip to Question 25-B below*)

A. If yes, how did you obtain textbooks for students? (*Check all that apply*)

☐ Through Vista I obtained books from other college bookstores. 61/

☐ I made my own arrangements with a local bookstore to provide texts. 62/

☐ I sent students out on their own to find books. 63/

☐ Other (*please describe*) ______________________________ 64/

____

B. If no, why haven't you used textbooks?

☐ I preferred to use a text, but there was not enough time to order books and get them before the class began. 65/

☐ Textbooks are not appropriate for my class. 66/

☐ Other (*please describe*) ______________________________ 67/

____

26. What else could or should the support staff at Vista do to help make your job in teaching outreach classes easier or more productive?

____

______________________________ 68/

______________________________ 69/

27. In general, how have you liked teaching at Vista? 70/

^{1}☐ I have liked teaching very well

^{2}☐ I have liked teaching fairly well

^{3}☐ I have liked it a little

^{4}☐ I haven't liked it at all

A. What things have you liked best about teaching at Vista? __________

______________________________ 71/

______________________________ 72/

B. What things have you liked least (or disliked) about teaching at Vista?

____

______________________________ 73/

______________________________ 74/

(2) 75-80/B

___ ___ ___ (1-3)

4/3

28. In a noncampus community college, staffed primarily by part-time faculty, it is difficult to plan appropriate inservice activities. *For each topic listed below, please check one box to show how important you think it is to include the topic in faculty meetings or workshops.*

	High priority, extremely relevant 4	Relevant, but not high priority 3	Not needed, not relevant 2	Can't decide 1	
Programs on how to become a more effective teacher (lecturer, discussion group leader).	☐	☐	☐	☐	5/
How adults learn and appropriate ways to teach them.	☐	☐	☐	☐	6/
New teaching methods (such as computer based instruction, television, methods for individualization).	☐	☐	☐	☐	7/
Grading. Issues and solutions when adults enroll for different reasons.	☐	☐	☐	☐	8/
Paper work for college (registration, attendance, grading, etc.).	☐	☐	☐	☐	9/
How to write course objectives, outlines and planning for course content.	☐	☐	☐	☐	10/
Retention. Ways to keep students in class once they enroll.	☐	☐	☐	☐	11/
Teacher evaluation (i.e., how to know whether or not we are doing a good job of teaching).	☐	☐	☐	☐	12/
How to write examination questions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	13/
How to design student evaluation methods other than written examinations.	☐	☐	☐	☐	14/
Development of the instructional program at Vista.	☐	☐	☐	☐	15/
Discussion of the nature and mission of the college.	☐	☐	☐	☐	16/
How to make optimal use of learning resources (AV, other learning aids).	☐	☐	☐	☐	17/

Other high priority subjects for Vista faculty workshops or meetings: *(Please list)*

____

____ 18/

19/

29. Would you be interested in serving on any of the faculty advisory committees listed below?

A. Evaluation of instruction 20/

^{1}☐ Yes, willing to serve
^{0}☐ No, not interested

B. Planning faculty inservice activities 21/

^{1}☐ Yes, willing to serve
^{0}☐ No, not interested

C. Instructional/curriculum planning and development 22/

^{1}☐ Yes, willing to serve
^{0}☐ No, not interested

D. Development of a Faculty Senate 23/

^{1}☐ Yes, willing to serve
^{0}☐ No, not interested

30, Building a sense of community at Vista is a challenge. We are trying to find ways to communicate with the large number of part-time faculty and bring continuity to instruction. In your opinion, what are the best ways for the college to communicate with the faculty? *Please read the list below and then check the* ***3*** *best ways.*

24-26/

^{1}☐ Through a regular newsletter dealing with teaching and learning.
^{2}☐ By offering a variety of short seminars which faculty attend based on their individual interests.
^{3}☐ By having a one-day Saturday workshop each semester.
^{4}☐ By meeting in discipline/program groups once each semester.
^{5}☐ By selecting priority interests of faculty and offering 2 or 3 seminars during a semester to gain depth of understanding on a specific topic.
^{6}☐ By providing written material through the faculty handbook and periodic supplements.
^{7}☐ By providing material on video tapes or audio tapes which faculty could use at their convenience.
^{8}☐ By providing individualized written learning materials.
^{9}☐ Some other way (*Please describe*) ____________________

____

____.

31. As you know, at the present time, there is no extra payment for faculty to attend inservice activities at Vista. New faculty are required to attend an initial orientation meeting. Beyond the initial required orientation, how much time do you think it is reasonable to expect faculty to participate voluntarily in activities other than teaching during a semester when they are employed? *Check only one answer.*

1( ) One to three hours per semester. 27/

2( ) Over three hours if activities being offered are of interest and needed by faculty.

3( ) Beyond the required initial orientation to teaching, instructors should not be expected to participate in activities other than teaching without compensation.

32. Please use the space below to tell us anything else we should know about your opinions and perceptions about teaching at Vista which has not been covered here. Please give us any additional comments that you think would be helpful in the development of the college. If you need more space, please continue your comments on the back of this page.

28-29/
30-31/
32-33/

Please return the questionnaire by mail in the return envelope provided.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
96 Powell Library Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

AUG 15 1980

(3)